

THE ECUMENICAL REVIEW

A QUARTERLY

published by

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

(Incorporating CHRISTENDOM, former publication of the American Committee for the World Council of Churches)

Editor:

W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

Associate Editors:

NILS EHRENSTRÖM, PAUL MINEAR, OLIVER S. TOMKINS

Assistant Editor:

H. H. HARMS

Board:

Archbishop YNGVE BRILIOTH (Chairman), S. BARTON BABBAGE, G. BAEZ-CAMARGO, P. DEVANANDAN, SUZANNE DE DIÉTRICH, W. FREYTAG, WALTER M. HORTON, DANIEL JENKINS, C. KONSTANTINIDIS, H. KRAEMER, CHARLES MALIK, R. B. MANIKAM, BENJAMIN E. MAYS, HENRY P. VAN DUSEN, E. DE VRIES

Except where otherwise indicated the writers of the articles are alone responsible for the opinions expressed

VOLUME X

JULY 1958

NUMBER 4

THE SUPER-CHURCH AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

by

W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

Critics of the ecumenical movement express the fear, sometimes even the conviction, that that movement is seeking to create a Super-Church. Though the word is new and though those who use it most often have so far not yet explained what exactly they mean by it, it has the merit that it gathers up various objections, concerns and antipathies which have deep roots. It is, therefore, necessary to ask which images are called up by it and which historical reminiscences it brings back to people's minds. We have to ask also in how far there are in the life of the ecumenical movement, and more specifically the World Council of Churches, elements or tendencies which correspond to these images.

What is this Super-Church? At this point we will only give a provisional definition. The Super-Church is a centralised ecclesiastical institution of world-wide character which seeks to impose unity and uniformity by means of outward pressure and political influence and thus denies the New Testament conception of the Church of Christ.

The Super-Church in General History

The depth and intensity of fear of an ecclesiastical institution which has secular force at its disposal, is easily understood, if we remember that some of the greatest crises in Western history are wholly or partly struggles for liberation from such power. The conflict between the Emperors and the Popes, the Reformation in its political aspects, the Thirty Years War, the reaction against Louis XIV and the Glorious Revolution, the resistance against the Holy Alliance are all in one way or another inspired by the conviction that the monopolistic all-powerful Church represents a tremendous danger. And the heroes who have fought these great battles such as Emperor Frederick II, King Gustavus Adolphus or King William I are known to us as champions of liberty.

At the same time in the national histories of many of the Western countries the struggle against the Super-Church had decisive significance. Think of the place of John Hus in the history of Bohemia, Martin Luther in Germany, William the Silent in Holland, John Knox in Scotland. These — and many others — all considered it as part of their life-task to liberate their countries from the domination of the Roman Super-Church. And we can add the Byzantines in their resistance against Latin invasion through the crusades and in other ways. The irony of history was, of course, that this was not the end of the story. For the national history of the U.S.A. began with pilgrims who sought to escape the national monopolistic churches which had taken the place of the international one. And the pilgrims themselves were not free from the Super-Church complex either.

The fact remains however that the historical reminiscences of many of our nations include the successful revolt against what they considered to be a tremendous danger for their spiritual and national integrity. It should be added that even in nations with a strongly Roman Catholic background there are similar memories. The conflict of the Gallican Church with Rome in the time of Louis XIV or the struggle of Garibaldi against the Papacy are cases in point.

The Super-Church in Church History

The struggle between the great centralised ecclesiastical power-centres and the movements for spiritual freedom are a central theme of church history. Every one of the churches in the World Council of Churches has at one time or another been involved in such conflicts. Its results can be read on those black pages of church history which are not easily forgotten by those concerned. The St. Bartholomew's Eve and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the persecution of the Waldensians, the expulsion of the Salzburg Protestants and many similar incidents remain warnings against the Super-Church in any shape or form.

It is a melancholy fact that the super-church mentality has also found expression in the very churches which had suffered persecution themselves. The way in which the Arminians were treated in seventeenth century Holland, the attitude of many European Protestant churches, first to Anabaptists and Quakers, later to the emissaries of the British and American Free Churches, the early history of Methodism in England and of the Salvation Army in many countries show how difficult it is for any large church to get rid of the super-church psychology.

It remains, however, true that all churches in the World Council have their specific historical reasons for opposing the re-emergence of a great centralised, powerful, ecclesiastical world body which would be able to dictate to them and control them. This is not only true of the small churches like the Waldensians or the Spanish Evangelical Church. It is equally true of large churches. None of them is ready to give up its spiritual independence and autonomy.

The Super-Church in the World's Literature

The Super-Church with its iniquities is not only a theme treated in the volumes of the theologians or in the pamphlets of reformers and sectarians. It is also an abiding theme in the world's great literature.

Dante is the pioneer in this field. There are passages in the *Divina Commedia* in which he attacks the hierarchy for its worldliness and lust for power. One of the most explicit is in the 27th Canto of the *Paradiso*. St. Peter denounces the doings of Boniface VIII, the Pope of the Bull "Unam Sanctam" with its astounding claims. All heaven grows red as the tale of shame is told. Peter says: "He who usurpeth

my place, my place, my place, which in the presence of the Son of God, is vacant, hath made my burial-ground a conduit for that blood and filth, whereby the apostate one who fell from here above, is soothed down here below... It was not our purpose... that the keys given in grant to me should become the ensign on a standard waging war on the baptised... In garb of pastors ravenging wolves are seen from here above in all the pastures. Succour of God! Oh, wherefore liest thou prone?"

Dante considers that the *vitium originis* lies in the combination of spiritual and secular power since Constantine. In the 19th Canto of the Inferno we read these lines:

"You deify silver and gold; how are you sundered
In any fashion from the idolater,
Save that he serves one god and you a hundred?
Ah, Constantine! what ills were gendered there—
No, not from thy conversion, but the dower
The first rich Pope received from thee as heir!"

John Milton echoes Dante in a violent passage of the twelfth book of "Paradise Lost." The poet has described the beginnings of the evangelisation of the nations by the apostles. But this is his description of the further history of the church:

"They die; but in their room, as they forewarn
Wolves shall succeed for teachers, grievous wolves,
Who all the sacred mysteries of Heaven
To their own vile advantages shall turn
Of lucre and ambition, and the truth
With superstitions and traditions taint...
Then shall they seek to avail themselves of names,
Place and titles, and with these to join
Secular power, though feigning still to act
By spiritual, to themselves appropriating
The Spirit of God, promised alike and given
To all believers; and from that pretence,
Spiritual laws by carnal force shall
Force on every conscience...
Whence heavy persecution shall arise
On all who in the worship persevere
Of spirit and truth..."

In these lines we have practically the whole catalogue of sins of the super-church.

In French literature the principal crusader against the Super-Church is, of course, Voltaire. "Ecrasez l'infame" — "destroy that infamous force which has made for ignorance, superstition, intolerance, persecution" is his Leitmotiv. In 1765 he writes a story which contains his conception of the last Judgment. The three principal figures are the Cardinal of Lorraine (who had been involved in the Massacre of St. Bartholomew), John Calvin and the Jesuit Le Tellier (prominent in the persecution of the Jansenists). When these three appear before the celestial tribunal they claim that they have consecrated their lives to the defense of doctrinal orthodoxy. But all three are condemned and burned.

Goethe also joins in the attack on a hierarchy characterised by lust for power. In the second part of the *Faust* there is a curious passage in which¹ the imperial chancellor, a high prelate, is the spokesman of the reactionary classes, the clergy and the nobility, while Mephistopheles becomes the advocate of spiritual freedom and progress. Later on the same prelate, who has become archbishop and arch chancellor of the Roman Empire,² appears again as a grasping, power-hungry politician who seeks to enrich the Church as much as possible. His concluding words are typical:

"Die Kirche segnet den, der ihr zu Diensten fährt"
(The Church blesses those who render it service)

But the most terrifying indictment of the super-church in the world's great literature is surely that of Dostoyevsky in the famous story about the Grand Inquisitor in "The Brothers Karamazov." The point of the story is that the Grand Inquisitor appears as the true humanitarian. Men desire happiness. But happiness and liberty are antithetical. The great mistake which Christ made was to expect a spontaneous response. The Inquisitor says to Christ: "You did not descend from the Cross because you were thirsty for a freely offered faith which is not based on miracle... But you overestimated men: they are only slaves, even though they are in revolt." Christ's mistake must be corrected. That is the task of the Church. It must rid men of the impossible responsibility of deciding for themselves. It must give men something that they can all worship together. For the sake of

¹ GOETHE, *Faust*, First Act, "Thronsal."

² *Op. cit.*, Fourth Act, "Des Gegenkaisers Zelt."

common worship they have killed each other in horrible conflicts. It is therefore necessary to do away with spiritual liberty and to impose one common faith.

The Super-Church Claims a Monopoly

The first characteristic of the Super-Church is its demand for a monopolistic position. It stands for the coherent "Corpus Christianum," a society which is based on and held together by a definite common faith as embodied in one single Church.

The concept has its roots partly in the Old Testament and partly in Greco-Roman history. The Christian society is conceived as an heir of Israel and must have the same religious unity as Israel had. This Israel-motif has dominated the thinking of churchmen and statesmen for many centuries. Alcuin called the Empire of Charlemagne "Mount Sion." But Cromwell spoke the same language: "Truly you are called by God, as Judah was to rule with Him and for Him."¹

The second root is the classical concept of the relation between religion and state. The state must be based on a common recognition of the gods. There is room for much variety within this system, but there is no room for refusal to worship the gods. For the state cannot exist without a unifying religious ideology. Constantine and his successors in accepting Christianity did not give up this basic assumption. On the contrary the introduction of Christianity as the official religion was largely a new attempt to provide a more solid foundation for the threatened unity of the Empire.

This notion that the existence of the state requires religious unity leads to that integration of church and state which we call the Corpus Christianum. Ernest Barker has defined it as follows: "a single integrated community: state and church. One body of men had henceforth two aspects: in one aspect it was a community-state, becoming a community-state-and-church and in the other it was a church."²

The Corpus Christianum ideology cannot conceive of accepting a plurality of churches. Its tenacity is shown by the fact that it was taken over by the reformers who in other ways fought the super-church tendencies of Rome. The Augsburg peace of 1555 was based on the principle "cuius regio, illius religio" — each territory was to have its

¹ Speech I.

² Ernest Barker in *Church and Community*, Oxford Conference 1937 Series, p. 45.

own monopolistic church. Richard Hooker formulated the English version of the same concept when he wrote: "Albeit properties and actions of one kind cause the name of a church to be given unto a multitude, yet one and the selfsame multitude may in such sort be both, and is so with us, that no person appertaining to the one can be denied to be also of the other."

The monopolistic church is naturally tempted to use temporal power to maintain its monopoly. This may take the extreme form of the claim made in the Bull "Unam Sanctam" (1302) that "it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff" both in temporal and spiritual matters. Or it can take the form of ecclesiastical pressure on the state to deny religious liberty to those who appear to threaten the religious unity of a nation.

The Super-Church as a Self-centred Institution

There is also the danger of increasing institutionalism of the large, powerful ecclesiastical body. In their empirical life churches are subject to the laws of sociology. One of these is that institutions tend to become so preoccupied with the maintenance of their own organisation, that they cease to serve the purpose for which they have been created. This is a particular danger for churches because they can so easily convince themselves that in defending their institutional life they are defending the cause of the Kingdom of God. Toynbee puts it this way: "The worst temptation that lies in wait for citizens of the Civitas Dei is... to idolise the terrestrial institution in which a Church Militant on Earth is imperfectly though unavoidably embodied."¹

The ecclesiastical body is in danger of falling into the hands of church bureaucrats whose main preoccupation is to keep the ecclesiastical machine going, who are therefore unready to receive new inspiration or new spiritual insight, who tend to form a caste of specialists unrelated to the life of the laity, who forget (to use the words of a Catholic layman, Baron von Hügel) that "Church officials are no more the whole Church, or a complete specimen of the average of the Church, than Scotland Yard or the War Office or the House of Lords, though admittedly necessary parts of the national life, are the whole, or average samples of the life and fruitfulness of the English nation."²

¹ TOYNBEE, *A Study of History*, VII, p. 548.

² BARON VON HÜGEL, *Essays and Addresses*, p. 16-17.

Every institutionalised church is tempted to promote uniformity and so to suppress the free expression of the varying charismata in the Body of Christ. The Roman Catholic Church has often shown a remarkable gift for canalising various spiritual movements through the creation of its religious orders. But it has also suppressed vital expressions of new spiritual insight. And every Christian must watch with concern the great struggle which is now going on within that church between the forces of centralisation or "intégrisme" and the forces which work for a renewal of church life. There is the encouraging fact of the biblical movement, of the attempt to disentangle the church from entangling alliances, a serious preoccupation with ecumenical issues. But there is also the discouraging fact of the many interventions by which promising developments in theology or new approaches to the industrial workers and youth are arrested. It should however not be thought that institutionalism and uniformity are only found in large, hierarchically constituted churches. These two dangers threaten every church. And some of the most extreme examples of strong control by an oligarchy and rigid enforcement of strict orthodoxy in doctrine and conduct are found in small churches and sects.

The real issue at this point is not in the first place a question of size, but a question of fundamental attitude. The danger of the Super-Church lies in its introversion, its preoccupation with the maintenance of its traditional forms of life, its transformation of means into ends, its unwillingness to let itself be fundamentally renewed.

Unity at Any Price

It is characteristic of the super-church mentality that unity is conceived as an aim in itself and, if necessary, pursued by means which are incompatible with the nature of the Gospel and of the Christian Church. The great truth that the Church is essentially one and that it should manifest this unity is not seen in relation to the equally important truths that Christian unity means a free common acceptance of the Gospel and cannot be imposed by outward pressure or any form of constraint.

A glance at the history of efforts towards reunion of separated churches shows that up to the 19th century those who stood for a spiritual unity achieved by purely spiritual means were like voices crying in the wilderness. The approaches to reunion which got beyond the stage of theoretical discussion were those in which a powerful church

could exert political pressure on a weaker church or in which the "raison d'état" played a considerable role.

This becomes particularly clear in the relations between the Latin and Eastern Churches. On three different occasions the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches was proclaimed: in 1204 when the Crusaders had taken Constantinople, in 1274 at the Council of Lyons and in 1439 at the Council of Florence. In the Duomo of Florence we can still read the inscription: "Shout for joy, O world, for the wall has been destroyed which separated the Western and the Eastern Churches; peace and unity have returned." But none of these reunions proved lasting. They had been engineered for secular reasons; they were imposed from the top and in no way rooted in the convictions of the faithful.

Reflections of this dangerous tradition are found in those unions which are motivated in part by a desire for Christian unity and in part by political considerations and in which governments are actively involved. The Prussian Union of the beginning of the nineteenth century has still to defend itself against the objection that its creation was so largely due to the initiative of the King of Prussia. The Anglo-Prussian agreement concerning the Jerusalem Bishopric proved unworkable because it was a diplomatic arrangement and did not really reflect a deep understanding between the churches involved.

The Super-Church as the Apocalyptic Babylon

The most powerful spiritual weapon in the battle against the super-church has certainly been the identification of the powerful and worldwide ecclesiastical institution with the Babylon of Revelation 17, the harlot which commits fornication with the kings of the earth.

It would seem that the origin of this exegesis is to be found in the writings of Joachim of Floris (about 1130-1202), the abbot from Calabria who elaborated a prophetic interpretation of history and made a deep impression on his time. One of his followers, Pierre Jean d'Olivi (1248-1298) of Languedoc says quite explicitly of the Church of Rome: "She is Babylon, the great whore, because wickedness thrives in her."

But it is not only the visionaries who make this identification. In the tremendous conflict between the Emperor Frederick II and the Papacy the same accusation plays its role. Frederick writes to the Kings and

Princes of Europe in 1239: "Consider this general scandal of the world, the division of the peoples, the eclipse of justice. All this unworthiness emanates from the elders of Babylon."¹

Soon afterwards Dante uses the apocalyptic image to describe the corruption of the Church. In the *Inferno* the poet says to Pope Nicholas III:

"Pastors like you the Evangelist showed forth,
Seeing her that sitteth on the floods committing
Fornication with the Kings of the earth."²

In the *Purgatorio* the subject is dealt with at greater length and with detailed applications of the vision of the 17th chapter of the Book of Revelation³.

John Hus in his attack on Simony warns the faithful against any participation in the practices of the city alienated from the true King, Jesus Christ, and describes that city as Babylon, the congregation of the wicked. Savonarola, preaching in Florence, cries out: "Fly from Rome, for Babylon signifies confusion, and Rome hath confused all the Scriptures, confused all vices together, confused everything." Many years before Luther speaks out, the young Albrecht Dürer draws his famous illustrations of the Apocalypse. When he comes to portray the Woman on the Beast he adds a significant detail. Among the onlookers there is only one who goes down on his knees before the Woman. And this is a clergyman!

Thus it is not astonishing that the Reformers on the basis of this tradition continued to look upon the Church of Rome as the fulfilment of the apocalyptic vision and interpreted Babylon as the Apostate Church. In the next century however we find, that while the Reformation Churches continue to speak of Rome as the apocalyptic Babylon there arises a more radical movement which calls all organised churches by that name. Under the influence of the individualistic mysticism of Jacob Böhme these super-reformers describe all churches as "the Babylon of the external Church." One of the most violent denunciations of the visible church as Babylon is that of Gottfried Arnold. In "Babel's Grablied" he writes:

¹ HASE, *Vorlesungen zur Kirchengeschichte*, II, p. 307.

² DANTE, *op. cit.*, Canto XIX.

³ *Op. cit.*, Cantos XXXII and XXXIII.

"The Council of the watchmen appointed by God
Proclaims the sentence on the wounds of Babylon :
Its sickness is so desperate, that there is no doctor,
No medicine to cure it."

The apocalyptic sects of the 19th century take the same line. They interpret the expression "mother of harlots" in the sense that the original Babylon, Rome, has daughters and that these daughters are all the other apostate ecclesiastical bodies. Thus the first Adventist missionary to Europe (Andrews) declared in 1874 : "Babylon is the apostate churches . . . all those religious bodies which have become corrupt like the mother of harlots." ¹

This interpretation is advocated to-day by certain fundamentalist movements and also applied to the ecumenical movement. Their view is that there will be an increasingly definite realisation of the apocalyptic vision and that this will take the form of a universal ecclesiastical organization including Rome or dominated by Rome and manifesting the great apostasy. Since it is also believed that the World Council is on the way to create such a centralised, all-embracing ecclesiastical body the conclusion seems to be evident : the WCC is a modern incarnation of the apocalyptic Babylon ².

The Ecumenical Movement as a New Approach to Unity

In view of the unhappy and even tragic experiences which humanity has had with the Super-Church it is not surprising that there is in many quarters deep distrust of all movements for Christian unity. Are they not simply attempts to repeat the old errors in another form? Are they not in fact on the way toward creating some new edition of the Super-Church? Will they not seek to impose unity and uniformity on all and suppress religious liberty?

Since these questions are not merely theoretical, but "existential" they deserve a serious answer. It is not enough to affirm that the ecumenical movement does not want to be a super-church. We must show that its presuppositions, its spirit, its structure are fundamentally different from those of the Super-Church.

¹ FROMM : *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers*, IV, p. 1100.

² See PACHE, *Œcuménisme*, p. 173.

- a) *The ecumenical movement is not motivated by political, social or institutional concepts of unity, but by the biblical affirmation that the Church of Christ is one.*

There is nothing new in this motive — except that in the course of history it has hardly ever been allowed to operate by itself. As we have seen, the story of Christian unity has been the story of Christian unity accompanied and qualified by secular concerns. Those who desired Christian unity for spiritual reasons have met with little or no response.

In so far the ecumenical movement is an unprecedented and new approach to unity. For the first time churches come together, not because governments force them to do so, not because they seek secular advantages or because they desire to defend their position, but because they believe (as the 1950 Toronto statement puts it) that “it is a matter of simple Christian duty for each church to do its utmost for the manifestation of the Church in its oneness and to work and pray that Christ’s purpose for His Church should be fulfilled” (Toronto IV : 2).

- b) *The ecumenical movement does not seek a return to the sociological unity of the Corpus Christianum, but promotes the spiritual and manifest unity of churches which seek together to be the Church in the world.*

The Corpus Christianum is a mixture of spiritual and political or social motives. In the long run the Church lost far more than it gained by its participation in this alliance. For it lost its identity and integrity as the Church of Christ.

The various movements which sought to re-affirm the freedom of the Church, its specific calling, its distinctive nature as the people of God, prepared the way for the ecumenical movement. The slogan of Oxford 1937 : “Let the Church be the Church” was an expression of this rediscovery of the Church’s calling. The fact that in Russia and in Germany the Church was again in conflict with the world helped in creating this new church consciousness. So did the new biblical theology. Oxford 1937 had this to say on the Corpus Christianum :

“The Church has not yet faced the new situation with sufficient frankness. With the conservative instincts of all institutions of long standing and influence it has fought a defensive — and on the whole a losing — battle for the maintenance of as much as possible of the old ideal of the Corpus Christianum and of the privileges and authority which that implies. But such a policy is doubly mistaken. First, it is quite unrealistic. The younger churches have never wielded such an authority, and for the older

churches it is irrevocably gone — at least for the present era. Secondly, the ideal itself, though magnificent, was mistaken and premature. In practice it entailed more accommodation of the Church to the world than of the world to the Church. The present estrangement of the Church from the world is not due only to the torpidity of Christians. It is indeed actually deepened by the outburst of new spiritual life in the Church during the last hundred and fifty years as shown in the great missionary movements and in the quickened social conscience of Christians. For these make membership of the Church more costly and mere conformity less attractive.”¹

That is not the language of churches which seek to maintain or regain worldly privilege. In this connection it should be underlined that the number of state-churches in the World Council of Churches is only a small percentage of the total membership. And it should be added that leading representatives of those state churches in the World Council have been among the foremost champions of the spiritual independence of the Church.

c) *The ecumenical movement stands for religious liberty*

Since its very beginning the ecumenical movement has been deeply concerned about religious liberty. It does not merely seek such liberty for its member churches but for all churches.

The Aims of the CCIA (1946) include “encouragement of respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms; special attention being given to the problem of religious liberty.”

The Amsterdam Assembly adopted a substantial declaration on religious liberty which states that Christians “are concerned that religious freedom be *everywhere* secured”².

The CCIA played an important role in getting the article on religious freedom in the declaration on Human Rights adopted. The Central Committee on the WCC has dealt again and again with specific issues of religious freedom.

Thus the ecumenical movement has made it perfectly clear that its conception of unity has nothing to do with those concepts of political unity on an international or national scale which have traditionally been used to justify the suppression of religious liberty.

¹ *The Churches Survey Their Task*, Report of the Oxford Conference on Church Community and State, p. 200-201.

² Report, p. 97.

- d) *The ecumenical movement does not believe in unity imposed by pressure or constraint but stands for that unity which expresses itself in the free response of the churches to the divine call to unity.*

The World Council stands for real, manifest unity. But according to its principles it is out of the question that it should seek to force its member churches into union with other churches. This is expressly stated in the Toronto declaration of 1950 which was elaborated by the Central Committee. It says :

"The purpose of the WCC is not to negotiate unions between churches, which can only be done by the churches themselves acting on their own initiative, but to bring the churches into living contact with each other and to promote the study and discussion of the issues of church unity... No church, therefore, need fear that the Council will press it into decisions concerning union with other churches."

The WCC's Department on Faith and Order has strictly adhered to this conception.

- e) *The ecumenical movement does not promote unity as an aim in itself, but as part of the total calling of the Church of Christ.*

The Council does not stand for unity at any price or at any level or for unity as a recipe for all problems of church life.

The Call to the Churches concerning the first Assembly stated : "Our first and deepest need is not new organisation, but the renewal, or rather the rebirth of the actual Churches."¹ Similarly the Assembly section dealing with Faith and Order at Amsterdam said :

"Our churches are too much dominated by ecclesiastical officialdom, clerical or lay, instead of giving vigorous expression to the full rights of the living congregation and the sharing of clergy and people in the common life in the Body of Christ. We pray for the churches' renewal as we pray for their unity. As Christ purifies us by His Spirit we shall find that we are drawn together and that there is no gain in unity unless it is unity in truth and holiness."²

This is reflected in the activities of the Council. Many of them have to do with the renewal of life in the churches such as the departments concerning Cooperation of Men and Women, Laity, Youth, the Ecumenical Institute and Church and Society.

¹ Meeting of Central Committee, Buck Hill Falls, p. 85.

² Official Report, Amsterdam Assembly, p. 56.

- f) *The ecumenical movement seeks in its own life to avoid the dangers of concentration of power, of centralisation and institutionalism.*

At its very first Assembly the World Council made a declaration on "The Nature of the Council" from which we quote :

"The World Council of Churches is composed of churches which acknowledge Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. They find their unity in Him. They have not to create their unity ; it is the gift of God. But they know that it is their duty to make common cause in the search for the expression of that unity in work and in life. The Council desires to serve the churches, which are its constituent members, as an instrument whereby they may bear witness together to their common allegiance to Jesus Christ, and co-operate in matters requiring united action. But the Council is far from desiring to usurp any of the functions which already belong to its constituent churches, or to control them, or to legislate for them, and indeed is prevented by its constitution from doing so. Moreover, while earnestly seeking fellowship in thought and action for all its members, the Council disavows any thought of becoming a single unified church structure independent of the churches which have joined in constituting the Council, or a structure dominated by a centralised administrative authority."¹

Again the Constitution adopted at Amsterdam says specifically :

"The World Council shall offer counsel and provide opportunity of united action in matters of common interest. . . . The World Council shall not legislate for the churches ; nor shall it act for them in any manner except as indicated above or as may hereafter be specified by the constituent churches."²

Are these merely words ? No — these statements describe the reality of the life of the Council. For *all* churches in the WCC, whatever may be their form or order, have this in common that they refuse to accept any interference in their life by an ecumenical body. If ever such interference would be attempted, the churches would react immediately. The general fear of the super-church is a strong guarantee against the appearance of a super-church.

The structure of the Council is such that all member churches have representation on the Assembly. This means that small churches have a disproportionately large representation in the body which governs the Council and that it is out of the question that one church, or one confessional group could dominate the movement.

¹ Amsterdam Report, p. 127. — ² Amsterdam Report, p. 198.

The Presidium is composed of one Honorary President and six Presidents. This was done in order to avoid the impression that "some one church or confession would have too great a preponderance in the Council."¹

Is the plan of integration between the WCC and the International Missionary Council not an attempt to create a vast unified ecumenical body which will seek to control the missionary outreach of the churches and societies? It is nothing of the kind. Its purpose is simply to bring together two bodies whose work is already very largely carried on in the same countries, in the same fields of activity, among the same churches. The plan provides for far-reaching decentralisation so that the proposed Division on Mission and Evangelism would have very considerable freedom. At the same time the WCC will in no way control missionary operations, for it will continue to be based on the principle which both the WCC and the IMC have always followed, that ecumenical bodies are in no way to interfere with the autonomy of their member churches or councils.

The WCC and the Apocalyptic Babylon

It is implied in all that we have said that the WCC or the ecumenical movement has nothing to do with the Babylon of Revelation 17. For the World Council cannot possibly become that centralised, powerful and dominating ecclesiastical body which, according to certain of its critics, is foreshadowed in the Book of Revelation. Not one of its member churches would accept association with a council which would seek to lord it over the churches. Most of these churches remember too well how they had to fight for their freedom over against what they used themselves to call the babylonian church.

But a more radical question must be asked in this connection. Is it really possible to maintain that ancient exegesis according to which Revelation 17 speaks of a great, powerful, ambitious ecclesiastical institution? Is that interpretation justifiable in the light of our present biblical knowledge? The answer must be in the negative. The consensus of serious exegesis is that Revelation 17 and 18 do not speak of an ecclesiastical, but a political power. This can be shown in different ways.

¹ Amsterdam Report, p. 214.

First of all the city is described in terms which are only appropriate in the realm of the state. It has sovereignty (*basileia*) over the kings of the earth. It engages in violent warfare. It is a centre of economic activity on a vast scale.

In the second place Babylon's greatness, its idol worship, its fall are described in the language of the Old Testament. And the quotations from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel in chapters 17 and 18 of the Book of Revelation have to do with political powers, especially Babylon and also Tyre. These powers are described as idolatrous, but they are idolatrous *states*, not merely idolatrous religions. The fornication of the great city is explained in the words of Isaiah 23 : 17 and Nahum 3 : 4 which have to do with the temptations of mammonism and political imperialism. The fall of the great city is described in the terminology of Ezekiel (10 quotations) who announces the destruction of the wealthy and proud city of Tyre with its false sense of security.

In the third place the allusions which those chapters make to the events of the time have clearly to do with the Roman Empire. This Babylon *exists* : "The woman that you saw, *is* the great city" (17 : 18). And that city is identified by the seven hills and the seven kings. The use of "Babylon" for "Rome" is frequent in apocalyptic literature of the period¹.

Now there is no doubt that this imperial and commercial world power is so dangerous and demonic precisely because it makes also religious claims. Rome makes war upon the saints and it does this because they refuse to worship the Emperor. In a detailed study on the subject Martin Dibelius has shown that the martyrs of which the Book of Revelation speaks are the martyrs of the Caesar-worship in the region of Ephesus². Babylon means therefore in the first place the Roman Empire with its religious as well as political imperialism³.

I say "in the first place." For it is of course characteristic of apocalyptic literature that it speaks at one and the same time of actual historical phenomena and of powers or systems which appear in different forms in different periods of history. So it may be asked : even if the

¹ KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, I, p. 514.

² MARTIN DIBELIUS, *Botschaft und Geschichte*, II, p. 222.

³ The exegesis according to which the expression "mother of harlots" in Revelation 17 : 5 means "the Protestant daughters" of the Mother Church is also based on a misunderstanding. For the expression is rabbinical and means "harlot par excellence," just as "father of lies" (Joh. 8 : 44) means "arch-liar" (See KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, I, p. 512.)

Book of Revelation refers especially to the Roman Empire, is it not perfectly justifiable to apply such a prophecy to the Roman Church or even to a universal ecclesiastical organization such as the World Council? Have not the Popes themselves maintained that ecclesiastical Rome is in some sense the successor of the Roman Empire? Has not Hobbes called the Papacy "the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire"?¹

The answer must be that it is indeed justifiable to recognise Babylon in historical phenomena of other periods of history. Speaking of the Beast, Paul Minear says rightly: "All tyrants, all world conquerors, all imperialisms and nationalisms are embodiments of this beast."² But an interpretation is faithful only if there is a clear analogy between the "type" which the Scriptures give us and the phenomenon in which we see that type embodied to-day. Now there remains a fundamental difference between a political institution which makes religious claims and an ecclesiastical institution which makes political claims. A serious interpretation of the prophecies concerning Babylon must ask what are the common elements between the Old Testament prophecies used in Revelation and the concrete historical situation to which these chapters refer. We find that these common elements have to do with a super-state with a religious ideology rather than a super-church with a political ideology. The relevance of the solemn warning of those chapters should be clear to us in an age of totalitarianism and what Berdyaev called "ideocracy." George Adam Smith, writing before the rise of modern totalitarianism said: "For every phrase of John's that may be true of the Church of Rome in certain ages, there are six apt descriptions of the centres of our own British civilisation, and of the selfish atheistic tempers that prevail in them. Let us ask which are the Babylonian tempers and let us touch our own conscience with them."³ In other words it is too easy to look for Babylon outside our own environment. In our contemporary world of super-powers, of ideological warfare, of vast material wealth over against terrible poverty — we are all confronted with "Babylon."

The Bible does not tell us that we must expect as a necessary sign of the approaching end the emergence of a universal, all-powerful super-church which embodies the great apostasy and persecutes the true faith-

¹ *Leviathan*, II, p. 47. See TOYNBEE, VII, p. 696 ff.

² PAUL MINEAR, *Christian Hope and the Second Coming*, p. 156.

³ GEORGE ADAM SMITH, *The Book of Isaiah*, p. 200.

ful. It does not contain prophecies concerning a Super-Church. What the Bible has to say on the spiritual temptations of ecclesiastical bodies is said in other ways. First of all positively, in that it is made crystal-clear that the Church is to follow its master who came to serve, who humiliated Himself, who accepted the shame of the cross (John 13 : 15). And in the second place negatively in the solemn warnings of the old people of God in the Old Testament and the new people of God in the New Testament against a self-centredness which makes them deny their very being and mission : to serve as the instrument of God's plan. The New Testament message concerning the Super-Church is to be found in such words as we find in the Letter to Laodicea (Rev. 3 : 17) : "For you say, I am rich, I have prospered, and I need nothing ; not knowing that you are wretched, pitiable, poor, blind and naked. Therefore I counsel you to buy from me gold refined by fire, that you may be rich, and white garments to clothe and to keep the shame of your nakedness from being seen, and salve to anoint your eyes that you may see." And above all in the words of our Lord (Mt. 20 : 25) : "You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you..."

Conclusion

We may therefore conclude that the accusation that the World Council of Churches is a super-church or that it is on the way towards creating a super-church has no foundation in fact. The characteristics of the ecumenical movement of the churches are the very opposite of the traditional characteristics of the Super-Church. In the one case we find a centralised, authoritarian, monopolistic and politically minded ecclesiastical system. In the other an attempt to foster unity by purely spiritual means and with full recognition of the autonomy and specific charisma of each church or confession.

Does that settle the matter? Not altogether. The pastor and the psychologist know that though certain phobias or complexes may be quite unrelated to objective reality, they can be formidable psychological realities which must be taken seriously. Now the phobia of the Super-Church belongs to a large extent in that category. It is not based on experiences which have been met in the ecumenical movement, but on experiences met outside that movement and also on unhappy memories from bygone days. But the WCC would fail in its pastoral duty to those

who suffer from that phobia, if it did not seek to explain itself patiently and persistently to them. We must never forget that words like "unity," "union," "reunion" are words which still carry negative associations for large numbers of faithful Christians. We have not yet shown sufficiently that another unity is possible, one which is not based on constraint, on indifference to truth, or on desire for uniformity.

And there is this further consideration. It is not inconceivable that in spite of our definite and sincere intention not to create a super-church, the super-church mentality could enter by some backdoor. This adversary of the true Church also prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking some church or movement to devour. We must, therefore, ask ourselves whether we have taken this potential enemy seriously enough. To take it seriously is to realise that every advance toward unity must be accompanied by a corresponding advance in the purification of the churches from all conscious or subconscious desire for power. The spiritual implication of true unity is that a united church must be able to withstand the temptation which any increase in influence or power may bring with it. The Archbishop of Canterbury has recently said that unity "will not come until we are all strong enough in the Christian faith to bear with one another's differences and to refuse to exterminate them by force. . . . We are not yet fit enough in the sight of God to be a completely united Church."¹

With regard to the World Council of Churches itself our conclusion must also be that, while in intention, spirit and structure it differs fundamentally from the Super-Church in any form or shape it is not necessarily immunised against the infection by the super-church psychology which threatens every ecclesiastical body and more especially large ecclesiastical bodies. For though it does not have any power to control the churches and will surely never be given that power, it cannot be denied that through its very existence, through the statements of its Assemblies and Central Committee it exerts a real influence and develops a certain ethos. If we want the churches to render a common witness — and who can deny that such a witness is required of the churches? — we accept at the same time the fact that the common word of a body of representatives of these churches, even though no church is legally bound by it, receives a specific weight.

¹ *Church Times*, October 25, 1957.

How can we avoid the consequence than even in spite of the best intentions this will not lead *de facto* to the development of a super-church mentality? First of all by avoiding the use of a wrong terminology. Too often statements or actions of the World Council are described as statements and actions of "the World Church" ("Die Oekumene"). But the World Council is not the World Church; it is only a fellowship of churches and an agency to serve the churches. Secondly by defining more clearly than we have yet done what is meant by the well-known phrase of William Temple that "any authority that it (the World Council) may have will consist in the weight which it carries with the churches by its own wisdom." This phrase means in any case that the word of the Council is never a last word, but a first word, that is to say that it is the task of each church to consider whether it should or should not identify itself with positions taken by the World Council's organs. Thirdly by ensuring that the Council does not become the victim of a self-centred institutionalism which suppresses prophetic voices. Within the life of the Council there must always be opportunity for the expression of new insight, even if they are held by small minorities or individuals. Fourthly by refusing to overrule minorities in matters of spiritual significance. It is better to record disagreement than to seek to enforce agreement.

We cannot expect that the accusation that the World Council is on the way toward becoming a super-church will ever disappear altogether. For there are those who have such a deep mistrust of the historic churches that they see the Super-Church in every church. Our best answer to such sectarians is surely to manifest through actual renewal of the life of our churches, through fulfilment of the whole calling of the Church in its togetherness and unity, that in our day and generation the Holy Spirit uses the churches for His eternal purpose of salvation.

CHANGES IN PROTESTANT THINKING ABOUT THE EASTERN CHURCH

by

EDMUND SCHLINK

When Adolf von Harnack in his *History of Dogma* (especially Volume II) and his *What is Christianity?* published his very critical and disparaging views on the state of theology and spiritual life in the Eastern Church, he directed his remarks not only against the Eastern Church of relatively recent centuries but also against those doctrinal decisions of the ancient Church which the Reformers had expressly retained and which the churches of the Reformation felt had always bound them to the Eastern Church. (Harnack singled out particularly the decisions on dogma taken at the councils of Nicaea, Constantinople and Chalcedon.) Harnack's opinion was of course not representative of the Reformation churches as a whole but only of the liberal wing known as "neo-Protestantism." Alongside of the neo-Protestants, who felt themselves to be fundamentally at variance with Reformation teaching and with the Lutheran Orthodoxy that followed it, there was never any lack of energetic protest in the Protestant Church — also at the turn of the century — against this neo-protestant separation of the Church from its foundations in the ancient Church. Nevertheless Harnack's theses exercised a great influence upon Western thinking, and the Eastern Church was probably never regarded so critically and considered so strange as in the first two decades of this century. This is all the more true when one considers that Roman Catholic writers such as Bonomelli (*Die Kirche*, 1902) and Konrad Lübeck (*Die christlichen Kirchen des Orient*, 1911) seemed to share Harnack's view that the Eastern Church was torpid, ignorant and at a generally low level (Cf. Friedrich Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche*, 1937, p. 555 f.).

This situation has altered profoundly in the past thirty years.

First, the world pricked up its ears when the persecution of Christians in Bolshevik Russia began to be known. A church which could produce thousands of martyrs could not possibly be so torpid and moribund as it had been charged with being.

Then there were the many encounters with Orthodox emigrants — theologians and lay people — and with the Orthodox refugee congregations who gathered together with a loyalty that was as great as the distress in which they found themselves. The liturgy and piety of the Eastern Church began to exhibit in the Western world, quite unexpectedly, a vitality hitherto unknown.

But this impression of the Eastern Church upon the West remained at first on the sensuous and aesthetic level and did not yet signify that the West's conception of the Eastern Church as strange and unfamiliar had been breached and understanding produced. Such a break-through did come, though, when the Protestant Church in Germany also began to suffer oppression and persecution; liberalism's *Kulturprotestantismus* ceased to be a live option for the German Church, which was forced to rethink its positions. In the struggle of the German Church with National Socialist ideology, historic confessions and dogma took on new meaning, and in the struggle with the encroachments of a totalitarian power the ministry appeared in new perspective. In the midst of hostile attempts to crush the congregations of the Confessing Church, the services of worship where the Church gathered together assumed a new significance; and the more arrests increased and congregations, pastors and many individual Christians were cut off from one another, the more the unity of the Church, which in Christ is the same in all places and in all times, entered into the forefront of Christian thinking, hopeful and living. Then the walls separating the various confessions became peculiarly transparent. Christians began to hear the consoling voice of Jesus Christ, the one good Shepherd, speaking to them from many confessions where up till then they had not been accustomed to listening for it. At the same time the liturgy and the creeds of the ancient Church assumed new vitality in the worship life of Christians. In the awakening liturgical movement they experienced the unity of the Church as they appropriated words of confession, praise and petition, the same words in which the Church, from the earliest times onward, had been united through the centuries as it confessed His name and praised and called upon Him. The connection which the ancient Church saw between dogma and liturgy again began to be manifest.

The result was a new view of the Eastern Church. Precisely those elements which neo-Protestantism had criticized appeared in a new light. This could be illustrated at various points. Here I will confine myself to a few remarks on dogma in its relation to liturgy. I will seek

to shed light upon the change in Protestant understanding of the Eastern Church by referring to a certain, very important structural element of that Church, one of which many discussions of the Eastern church's decisions on dogma do not take adequate account. In understanding another church it is often more illuminating and of greater significance to perceive the structure *underlying* and at work in the doctrine, order and life of that particular church than to dwell upon the *details*.

1. One of the chief indictments brought against the development of dogma in the Eastern Church is that of Hellenization; more specifically, it has been charged that in the Eastern Church the Gospel suffers from an over-exposure to alien elements and that there is a syncretistic synthesis of Christian faith and pagan philosophy. Critics have had in mind particularly the appropriation of the ontological, metaphysical and "physical" concepts of Greek philosophy in the formulation of the doctrines of the Trinity and of Christology. Between this Greek mode of thought and that of the Old Testament and of Jesus — which is Hebraic — there is a real difference which cannot be overlooked, and the Hellenization in the ancient Church goes far beyond anything found in Paul, who pushes forward into the Hellenistic sphere. Moreover the Eastern Church made no secret of its Greek heritage nor was it ashamed of it.

The neo-Protestant critique of this state of affairs overlooked, to be sure, the fact that among the various possible responses of faith to the message of God's act of salvation there is one — attested by the New Testament writings and, indeed, present already in the Old Testament congregation — which bears a clear affinity to ontological statements and prompts to the use of ontological concepts. This is doxology, as we find it from time immemorial expressing itself, with almost an inner necessity, both in public worship services and in the prayers of the individual. Doxology rests upon and also praises God's act of salvation; but it goes beyond praise of God's act of salvation to praise of God himself who is the same from everlasting to everlasting. God cannot be contained within His act of salvation on our behalf and on behalf of his Church and the world. In the freedom of his being, which is the same from everlasting to everlasting, he has carried out the work of salvation and he wishes man to praise not only his work but also himself. Doxology is addressed to God, and yet God is here as a rule not addressed as "Thou," as he is in other prayers, but as "He," who is from everlasting to everlasting. In the doxology God is also not

implored to do this or that but is praised in His eternal glory, holiness, might, power and wisdom. Thus we find in the biblical doxologies, again and again, statements about God's being, His nature and His qualities. For example, Rom. 9 : 5 : "God who is over all be blessed for ever." Or the song of Rev. 4 : 8, in part a quotation of Is. 6 : 3 : "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was and is and is to come !" Or : "Amen ! Blessing and glory and wisdom and thanksgiving and honor and power and might be unto our God for ever and ever ! Amen" (Rev. 7 : 12).

Dogma in the Eastern Church is quite apparently determined to a large degree by the structure of doxology, for its dogma is determined by the structure of the credal confession of the service of worship. This confession is directed not primarily to the world but to *God*; it not only bears testimony before men but is offered to *God* as the Church's sacrifice of praise. Thus the decisions on dogma of the councils of Nicaea and Constantinople are direct credal confessions for use in the service of worship, and if the Christological decision of Chalcedon was not itself formulated and employed as such (the introductory words no longer read "We believe" but "we teach that it is necessary to confess") yet it is most intimately related to the credal confession of the service of worship, seeks to serve the same and still bears the unmistakable marks of hymnic and doxological style. If one understands the nature of doxology, then it can come as no surprise that the ancient Church drew upon ontological concepts from Greek metaphysics when formulating, developing and interpreting its dogma. The statements of doxology about God's being, nature and qualities were, in the nature of the case, a step in that direction ; but in addition it was precisely Hellenism, its language and its mode of thought, that constituted the historical terms in which doxology had to express itself ; and it was the Hellenistic environment to which doxology had to be interpreted.

But this need by no means signify syncretism and an over-exposure of the Gospel to alien elements. There is abundant proof that the Greek philosophical concepts employed in the dogmas of the ancient Church were subjected to thoroughgoing correction and profound transformation ; and, furthermore, that precisely the salient concepts of pagan thinking were turned to magnificent service in witnessing for the faith. In other words, the process initiated by Paul in taking the Gospel to the Hellenistic world was continued in the history of dogma in the ancient Church.

2. The Eastern Church is also charged with never having fixed any dogmas on man and his relation to grace, as was done in Western Christianity in connection with Augustine's battle with Pelagius and his followers and then, again, at the time of the Reformation and afterward; that is to say, dogmatic decisions on the questions of original sin, freedom of the will, etc., are lacking in the East. The cordial reception and even vindication which Pelagius met with in Palestine, and which Julian and even Coelestius experienced for a time in Constantinople, and the faint response in the East to the condemnation of Pelagianism by the Council of Ephesus were an early cause of Western mistrust of the East on this point. Even today one still meets Orthodox theologians who recognize Augustine as a gifted writer of the Church but not as a Church Father.

One cannot of course overlook the fact that the Eastern Church was not really interested in giving a dogmatic definition of sin and in determining what capacities the sinner still possesses apropos of his relation to grace. But once one has recognized the basic doxological structure of the dogma of the Eastern Church, then its reluctance to express itself on anthropological dogmas can come as no surprise; for it is characteristic of doxology that man recedes into the background. Even if the confession of faith begins with the words "we believe" or "I believe," yet as a rule the words "I" or "mine" or "we" or "our" do not occur again. It is rather *God's* deeds on behalf of the world and the Church which are confessed. Indeed, in the pure doxology the words "I" and "we" do not occur at all, not even in an introductory formula; it is only God who is mentioned: "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory." (Is. 6:3.) In the service of worship here on earth it is of course man who initiates the doxology. And God's saving work on his behalf is the reason why he praises and worships God. But in the act of worship the eyes of the believer are directed wholly away from himself to God; there are no sidelong glances at himself or the relation between what God has done and what he himself has done. In doxology God is all in all — it has no other content but God. The lack of anthropological dogmas in the Eastern Church is, therefore, partly a consequence of its approach to dogma, namely, the fact that its dogma is determined by the credal confession of the service of worship.

Now of course theology cannot get along without making statements about man. Such statements are abundant in the Old Testament

and in the New. In reality, the writings of the Eastern Church Fathers also contain an abundance of thinking about anthropology. The way in which they insist upon the freedom which man still possesses is striking (an emphasis entirely foreign to Augustine and the Reformers), as is their extensive appropriation of Greek and philosophical anthropology with but little modification of it by biblical anthropology (cf., e.g., John of Damascus' *Ekdosis*, II, 12-24). The anthropological statements of Eastern theology were not elevated into explicit dogmas about man, however, and this should not be regarded as something wholly negative. The Church's Christological and Trinitarian pronouncements differ fundamentally from its anthropological ones insofar as God's act of salvation in Christ has been carried out once and for all and the Triune God is the same from everlasting to everlasting. But man lives in history, subject to change and transitoriness, his self-understanding undergoing continual alteration. Man is torn this way and that by false concepts of human nature — libertinism and determinism, individualism and collectivism, and many others. First this side and then that has deceived him as to his true nature. It is in this situation that man is called to believe in God's decisive act in Christ and to praise Him for it. Thus anthropological dogmas are of necessity exposed to the vicissitudes of history to a much greater degree than are Christological dogmas, and it is obvious that numerous severe crises have arisen and many schisms have been engendered in Western Christianity precisely because it attempted to give to such historically-conditioned statements about the relation between sin and grace the full authority of dogma, statements which had digested the anthropological thinking of that particular age and had succeeded in addressing men where they actually *were*, with a call to repentance and faith. But do such anthropological dogmas still speak to the members of that particular church a hundred or two hundred years later?

3. Another charge made against the Eastern Church is that for over a thousand years doctrinal development has been at a standstill, even though during this time a great number of new questions have arisen in Christianity's intellectual environment and within Christianity itself, questions that the Church should have undertaken to answer in new doctrinal decisions. There was already, at the Council of Chalcedon, a decided disinclination to formulate new dogma and had it not been for the wishes of the emperor it is quite unlikely that anything would have been forthcoming. This disinclination grew steadily stronger with

the passage of time. "It was not only the innate traditionalism, common to all religions, which was opposed to change; it was also that concern for the ritualistic treatment of dogma which resisted change and suffered hurt with each new doctrinal formulation" (Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, 2nd edition, 1909, vol. II, p. 443). "It is only when one observes how the doctrinal controversies were — of necessity — always controversies about words which clamoured for inclusion in the liturgy that one realizes they were bound to awaken mistrust... The doctrinal controversies of the seventh century were in reality only an insignificant epilogue which merely gave dogma the deceptive appearance of being possessed of independent existence" (*ibid.*, p. 444). According to Harnack, the mystagogy of the Eastern Church gradually brought doctrine almost to the point of extinction (p. 443). Its mystagogic theology stifled dogmatics and usurped its place (cf. also p. 511).

The reasons why the development of dogma in the Eastern Church atrophied at an early period are of course many and various. The Arian controversies in the decades after the year 325 and the monophysite, monergist and monothelite controversies in the centuries after 451 certainly had severe repercussions, particularly in the Eastern Church. Another reason is that the Eastern Church was deprived of the freedom to make further dogmatic decisions by the emperors, for whom the unity of the Empire was of first importance; then in later times the assembling of an ecumenical council comprising all the geographical areas where there were Orthodox churches was a practical impossibility. But in the transition to a traditionalistic and scholastic mode of thought, there was also an unmistakable atrophy of the original vitality and strength of Greek systematic theology. In the midst of all these different historical factors, another extremely important one — that had an inhibiting effect upon the further formation of dogma — is the connection between dogma and liturgy. It would certainly be misconstruing the situation, however, were one to call attention only to a liturgical formalism of *words* and a mistrust in the Eastern Church of every move to alter *words* or add new ones. That the Eastern Church ceased dogmatizing shows rather that it wished to retain — and did retain — precisely the same *structure* of dogmatic statement as that employed by the ancient Church when it began to develop dogma, namely, doxological confession offered to God by the congregation when gathered for worship. The Eastern Church was concerned not only about retaining the *wording* of historical and

now commonly-used formulations; it also remained loyal to the *structure* which the Ancient Church's approach to dogma assumed, i.e., a structure in which credal confession is at once the sacrifice of praise of the service of worship and doctrine binding upon the worshippers. For this reason one cannot make the unqualified statement that dogmatic theology in the Eastern Church was stifled and replaced by mystagogic theology; rather, the dogma of the Ancient Church was from the very beginning an inherent part of the service of worship. But if this basic doxological structure of dogma is kept in mind, then it becomes clear that it is quite impossible to make statements about the sacraments, about church and state, natural law, etc., along the lines of those we find in the doxological confession of faith. For the nature of doxology is such that although it treats of the sacraments, the church and therefore the world and the contention between the two, yet the content of doxology is not the sacraments as such, nor the Church and the world as such, but the Triune God who is operative in and through them all. If dogma is approached as a doxological confession of faith — and if this approach is then maintained — then within the resulting doxological structure one will not find dogmas on the sacraments, the Church and the state as such. Interest is rather in the actual celebration of the sacraments, in the actual life of the Church in the world and therefore in the fixing of the liturgical and legal order in which this is all effected and within which the true credal confession is offered to God.

This tenacious loyalty of doctrinal development in the Eastern Church to its doxological beginnings cannot be simply regarded as a weakness, for it has meant that the Eastern Church has retained two important virtues which can become of increasing ecumenical significance. Let me explain what I have in mind.

a) If the Eastern Church did not make dogmatic decisions on a number of matters acted upon by Western Christianity, this does not mean that the Eastern Church was simply silent on these matters. Instead of expressing itself on the sacraments in the form of *dogmas* it drew up *liturgical* and *canonical regulations* for the celebration of the sacraments; that is, it by no means left the sacraments at the mercy of human whim and caprice. The same is true of ecclesiology. The significance of the fact that the Eastern Church was very hesitant about formulating dogmas on the sacraments and the Church, and instead expressed itself on these subjects mainly in the form of regulations for

the ordering of church life and the celebration of the sacraments, is that in the history of dogma in the East a very definite danger was rid of much of the potency it possessed in the West. I mean the danger that dogmatic thought may separate itself from the actual *event* of God's saving activity and imagine that by taking thought it can arrive at a vantage point from which it is possible to grasp in theory and, to a certain extent, calculate and balance off against one another the cooperation between God and man, divine grace and the human will, God's sacramental gifts and the earthly elements (water, bread and wine), the invisible and the visible Church. That in the Eastern Church there is not such a cleft between dogma and piety, as there is to some extent in the West, is a virtue. There is no doubt but that some problems in the history of theology, in the East as well as in the West, have arisen only because theology became detached from God's saving activity in the celebration of the sacraments, in the life of the Church, etc. To a certain extent these are problems which one may describe as being merely apparent, because they are no longer concerned with receiving and witnessing to God's gracious acts but with the theoretical explanation of those acts. In Western Christianity, however — in contrast to the Eastern Church — many theological problems of this sort were made the subject of *dogmatic decisions*; and since these dogmas deal with questions which are no longer directly informed by the reception of and the testimony to God's gracious working in the congregation gathered for worship, it is little wonder that the dogmas formulated in response to these questions diverge, both from century to century and from church to church. Although the Eastern Church has also reflected upon such problems, it has in large measure refrained from *dogmatizing* about them; and thus it has been more respectful of the mystery surrounding God's gracious work than has the West.

b) If the development of dogma comes to a standstill, this can be a weakness. It would be so indeed if a church where this had happened were to content itself with the mere repetition of its traditional dogmas, neglecting to interpret and relate them to new historical situations. It would also be a weakness if such a church were to attempt, simply by means of analogies based on existing dogmas, to come to terms with problems in those areas where no decisions on dogma had been taken. Thus some Eastern theologians have attempted to clarify the problems connected with Holy Communion through the use of analogies based on the doctrine of the Incarnation, or when considering

the problem of church and state they have drawn analogies from the doctrine of Christ's two natures. This method fails to bring out fully the uniqueness of Holy Communion or of the relation between Church and state. But reluctance to formulate dogmas is not, in itself, any more a weakness than a steady, sanguine advance toward new and ever more intricate dogmas is necessarily a sign of spiritual and theological strength. It could very well be just the opposite, for, as the history of dogma in the Roman Church shows, dogmas which are continually increasing in intricacy and detail prove in time to be so cumbersome that theological thinking becomes increasingly hampered in its movement and loses its broad catholicity. Dogmatizing that limits itself to the Christological and Trinitarian centre of the Christian faith, however, gives full scope to the unfolding of the riches available in Scripture, riches which are waiting to be utilized in a vigorous missionary thrust into the spiritual and intellectual situation of the Church's present environment. Sometimes the development of a "wealth" of dogmatic decisions of increasing refinement may be a denial of the fullness of biblical truth and so prove to be in reality not wealth but poverty. On the other hand, an apparent "poverty" of dogma may be in reality a form of wealth, because being centred in Christological and Trinitarian dogmas it discloses the fullness of biblical truth and thus promotes the unhindered development of catholicity in theological thought and in the Church's witness.

If, now, one attempts an appraisal of the history of dogma in the Eastern Church from these two points of view, then it becomes evident that the Eastern Church, precisely because of its peculiar reluctance to formulate dogmas, possesses very great and, in many respects, unique ecumenical possibilities. Ecumenical discussions in past years on problems of faith and order have shown again and again that we must approach the dogmas dividing the churches by going back to the place these dogmas occupy in the life of the churches, especially in the Church's liturgy and in its preaching and teaching. The further dogmatic statements become removed from their setting in the service of worship, the more difficult it is for divided churches to come to any agreement about them. Conversely, it has been the often quite astonishing experience at ecumenical conferences that these same churches, despite their dividedness, were able, in common acts of worship, to pray with one another and to receive from one another the proclamation of God's mighty acts of salvation. In that the Eastern Church in its dogmatic

utterances has retained the closest ties with the service of worship, it has in a very special way also retained the possibility of explaining its dogma from its setting in the worship service. Thus it assumes a central position midway between churches (such as the Roman Church) which have come to the point where their frequent dogmatizing has proved divisive of church fellowship, and on the other hand the extreme wing of Protestantism which rejects every tie of dogma (a principle that sets it off from Rome *and* the Reformers). In saying this, of course, everything depends on whether present-day Orthodoxy can muster the spiritual and theological strength and versatility to make use of its mediating position in such a way that it applies what it has inherited from Athanasius and Cyril — in the terms and concepts of the first centuries of the Christian era — to the concrete problems of the twentieth century, and in terms which this century understands and employs. The same is true, however, of any church which is in possession of a heritage of dogma deriving from the past — it is true, therefore, also of the Lutheran Church.

4. What we have said would be incomplete if we did not also call attention to various other ways — besides the liturgical way of Orthodoxy — in which faith responds to God's redemptive act in Jesus Christ.

Since in Christ God has revealed his love for the world, therefore we are to love in return. The response of love to God's love manifested in Jesus Christ is twofold: love of God and love for one's neighbour. Since God's love comes to us in the World which proclaims His love in Christ, we should respond with love in words addressed, first, to God in prayer and, second, to our neighbour in witness.

In *prayer* faith responds to God, addressing Him on familiar terms as "Thou." In Christ God has addressed me, a lost sinner, reaching out and rescuing me and bestowing His gifts upon me. Prayer gives me the opportunity to respond to Him, in Jesus' name, to thank him and call upon Him in the certainty that He will hear me and answer me, and not only me but his whole Church and yet within this Church also me. Among the various types of prayer, *doxology* occupies a special place, with the "I" and "we" of other kinds of prayer retreating into the background and God being addressed as a rule in the third person instead of the second. Furthermore, instead of God's succour being implored, he is praised for his wonderful works and worshipped as God from all eternity.

Faith responds in *witness*, the believer addressing his fellow man and proclaiming to him God's act of salvation. Witness too is response in the name of Jesus. The believer assures his fellow man that the same salvation which God has accomplished in Christ for the believer He has also worked "for you." The believer cannot hoard the Gospel which he has received — it is an urgent Word that forces its way into the world, laying hold of men and widening its outreach as it goes. It is the exalted Christ, the Lord, who through the Gospel is establishing possession of the world over which He reigns. When the believer witnesses, he addresses concrete individuals in their particular historical situation. His witness enters of necessity into the thought and language of that particular age, into the self-understanding, the world views, the concepts of God, the hopes, the morality and the immorality of those to whom the Gospel is to be proclaimed — it participates in all the vicissitudes of history.

Among the various ways of speaking the Gospel to our fellowmen, the special nature of doctrine should be stressed. Here the "I" of the believer addressing his fellowman, face to face, recedes into the background. Doctrine does not speak directly to a person, assuring him that salvation is "for you," it is not prophetic proclamation in the here and now. In the New Testament, doctrine (*didache*) is primarily transmission of the tradition that has been received regarding God's saving acts in history, done, once and for all, in Christ on behalf of the world. Doctrine tells about people in the past, but also about man and the world in general. It is therefore more strongly inclined to a fixed form of expression than is personal witness. Its "objectivity" distinguishes it from such witness in a way similar to that in which doxology is distinguished from prayers of petition. Doxology and doctrine are both responses of faith but the structure of doxology differs from that of doctrine and the two should not be confused with one another.

The original act in which the believer responds to the Gospel which he has heard, the act in which he subjected himself to the Lordship of Christ, is the *confession of faith*. In the confession of faith not only does it become clear that prayer and witness belong together but that prayer, witness and all the various forms of the response of faith converge in the confession in a peculiar way and there find their focus. The confession of faith is directed to God and yet it is at the same time witness before men. The confession finds the believer both acknowledging Christ as his Lord and joining in the Church's witness to Christ

before all the world. As a rule the confession of faith does not employ explicitly either the "Thou" addressed to God or the "you" addressed to one's fellowman; instead, it praises — before God and in the presence of men — God's act of salvation. In the confession of faith the self-surrender of the believer is so complete that not even the very fact of that surrender — indeed not even the person of him who surrenders himself — receives any mention, unless it is in the words "I believe" or "we believe." Thus, in the "objective" statements of the confession of faith the peculiar structure of doxology and doctrine are also uniquely recapitulated.

All these basic forms of Christian response belong together — and necessarily so — in the life of the Church and of the individual Christian. Not one of them can be relinquished without distorting the others. It is God's will that the response of faith express itself precisely in this sort of variety.

Dogma is rooted in confession. The history of dogma began as the history of the confession of faith, first of all of the confession made at baptism and in the service of worship, and then of the consensus — understood in this sense — of the Church. Since, now, the various forms of the response of faith are recapitulated in the confession of faith, it came about that in the history of dogma first one of these forms and then another — the doxological, say, or the kerygmatic — played a decisive role. Modifications of these forms resulted where dogma was no longer formulated as a confession for the service of worship, or as an expression of adoration or of witness, but as teaching concerning the proper way to confess, adore and witness. A further modification resulted where dogma no longer pointed out what one *was* to believe, confess, praise and testify to, but instead was limited to defining — in the anathema — what one must *not* believe. The element of separation from the world, which is always implicit in the original act of confession, became the explicit and, not infrequently, the sole content of dogma. In addition, a modification in the form of faith's response — one with grave consequences — was bound to result from the fact that from the fourth century onward the various confessions of faith used in the various churches were increasingly replaced by *one* confession, so that to be one in faith no longer meant the mutual and harmonious acknowledgement of one another's confessions but the use of one and the same form of confession. Modifications of this sort, which in themselves should not be approached with any preconceived

notions, must be kept in mind when comparing the dogmas of various periods of the Church's history, or when comparing the dogmas of one church with those of another.

What all this signifies is a difference in the structure of the dogmatic utterances of the Eastern Church and those of the Church of the Reformation. It is true that in the *worship life* of both churches all forms of the response of faith are very much in evidence: prayer and doxology, witness and doctrine, and all of these recapitulated in the confession of faith. But in the historical development of the Eastern Church, *dogma* was determined primarily by the doxological element in the confession of faith while in the Church of the Reformation it was determined by the kerygmatic element. The Church of the Reformation did, of course, hold with conviction to the creeds of the ancient Church — both as dogma and as an essential part of the liturgy. Its own dogmatic utterances, however, were expressed not in doxological confessions but in ones which (like the Augsburg Confession) were addressed, *coram Deo*, to the emperor and the empire. Thus in the Augsburg Confession *docere* means, as a rule, to preach, to proclaim, to testify; and in Melancthon's Apology for Augsburg, Article IV (*De justificatione*), there are whole passages in which the effect is that of pastoral comfort and assurance and evangelical preaching. As a result, none of the confessions of the Lutheran Reformation were produced for the liturgy of the service of worship nor was any of them incorporated into the liturgy. Later, in the development of seventeenth century Orthodoxy, this structural modification had this result: *doctrina*, even when the word no longer signified preaching itself but teaching about what was to be preached, still addressed itself primarily to the sermon and did not develop into mystagogic theology.

In these differences in the form of faith's response, there are not as yet any necessarily irreconcilable antitheses between the two churches — but such *can* develop. On the Orthodox side, that could conceivably happen if the ontological structure of its doxology were made into the predominating pattern of its theological thinking in general and of its anthropology in particular. That would call into question not only the historical nature of man but also the contingent character of God's acts of salvation. On the side, in the Church of the Reformation, the same kind of thing could happen of the pattern of witness, of pastoral assurance, of personal encounter with God and thus the I-Thou correlation of encounter be absolutized, to the exclusion of all other

forms of theological statement. For this would be calling God's deity into question, since God is, after all, not contained within His act of revealing himself to man in an historical encounter; indeed, it is in this act that He reveals himself as the one who is the same from everlasting to everlasting. But if either of these forms of theological statement not only receives special emphasis but is also carried to extremes, and made the one and only pattern of theological thought, then false alternatives and antitheses divisive of church fellowship arise. Then it is no longer only separated churches that confront one another but also ontological and personalistic philosophical systems; held captive by such, one group of Christians is then incapable of regarding the dogma of another group of Christians as a "confession" of Christ.

In present-day ecumenical contacts between churches, we are confronted by the task not only of comparing the differences in dogma which exist between us, but also reinterpreting them by tracing them back to their roots in the act of confession of faith. Then we must recognize the function of different statements of dogma within the variety of the multitude of responses which God demands of us.

BAPTISTS AND THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

by

J. D. HUGHEY, Jr.

The great majority of Baptists have always felt their kinship with large numbers of other Christians. The British Particular Baptist Confession of 1677, reaffirmed several times in England and America, showed "hearty agreement" with Presbyterians and Congregationalists in most matters; and the General Baptist "Orthodox Creed" of the following year had as one of its purposes the uniting and confirming of "all true Protestants." In a very important sense Baptists have long been a part of the ecumenical movement. They have not always agreed as to the extent of their participation or the form that it should take. We shall consider Baptist attitudes toward church union and membership in the World Council of Churches.

I

Baptists have from time to time manifested considerable interest in church union. Even the Southern Baptist Convention, which is now very far from any thought of union with other bodies, for several years seriously considered the subject of Christian union. In 1890 it passed the following resolution: "We respectfully propose to the general bodies of our brethren of other denominations to select representative scholars, who shall seek to determine just what is the teaching of the Bible on the leading points of difference of doctrine and polity between the denominations." The conclusions were to "be widely published in all denominational papers, so that the Christian public may be thoroughly informed concerning Christian union."¹ For several years there were annual reports to the Convention on the subject of Christian union.

¹ BARNES, *The Southern Baptist Convention, 1845-1953* (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1954), p. 271.

Prominent British Baptists have eagerly advocated church union. The Secretary of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland during the first quarter of this century, J. H. Shakespeare, dreamed in his later years of a union of all free churches and even of a union of all churches in his country. He said, "The days of denominationalism are numbered. There is nothing more pathetic or useless, in this world, than clinging to dead issues, worn-out methods, and antiquated programmes." He especially shocked his fellow Baptists when after saying, "It is no use concealing my conviction that reunion will never come to pass except upon the basis of episcopacy," he declared his willingness to accept that for the sake of church union. There was a conflict among British Baptists which ended in Shakespeare's nervous breakdown and resignation¹. His successor wrote of him:

... Was Shakespeare too sanguine? I think he was... His brotherly heart seemed unable to understand that anything could come in the way of that drawing together of Christians that to him looked so natural and right. He underestimated stubborn difficulties and paid, in the event, a heavy price for his optimism².

In 1926, two years after Shakespeare's resignation, the annual assembly of the British Baptist Union replied to the Lambeth Appeal for Christian Union. Courteously but firmly the bases for Christian union proposed by the Anglican Church were rejected, with special reference, of course, to the sacraments and ministry. Reasons for believers' baptism by immersion were given, and the idea that "the effect of the Lord's Supper as a means of grace should be held to depend on episcopal ordination" was rejected. The place given the sacraments by the Lambeth Appeal, said the Baptist statement, would "exclude from the universal church of our Lord bodies of devoted Christians with whom we enjoy fellowship, and to this exclusion we cannot assent." The ministry was declared to be "an office involving both the inward call of God and the commission of the Church," not dependent for its validity upon an episcopate, and not of such a nature that its functions could not be performed if necessary by other believers thus called upon by the church. The reply continued:

¹ A. C. UNDERWOOD, *A History of the English Baptists* (London: Kingsgate Press, 1947), pp. 252 ff.

² M. E. AUBREY, "John Howard Shakespeare, 1857-1928," *The Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1957, p. 106.

It will be gathered from this reply that union of such a kind as the Bishops have contemplated is not possible for us. We would say this not only with that frankness which we believe is the highest courtesy among Christian brethren, but with the assurance of our regret that the way in which they would have us go with them is not open.

Further progress in the direction of Christian unity can be secured, we are convinced, only by unreserved mutual recognition¹.

Most Baptists would hesitate to enter into any scheme of church union which would mean a sacrifice of basic principles. Early in the present century E. Y. Mullins of the Southern Baptist Convention wrote :

The plea of Baptists... is not a plea for "organic" union as the chief goal of endeavour at present, however desirable and important Christian union is in itself. Their plea is rather for the spiritual rights of mankind : the competency of the soul in religion under God, the equality of all men in direct dealing with God, the equal rights of believers in the church, the principle of responsibility as growing out of the freedom of the soul. The axioms of religion lie at the heart of New Testament Christianity. If the evangelical bodies which have added to their systems those elements which contravene the axioms and subvert the spiritual rights of the race will discard them, Christian union will come of itself².

At the 1934 Baptist World Congress, Gilbert Laws, in an address on "Baptists and Christian Unity: What Is Possible," said that in addition to what they hold in common with all Christians Baptists have the following distinctive emphases :

(1) A credible profession of conversion is a prerequisite to membership in the Church. (2) Baptism is for believers, and for believers only. (3) A local assembly of believers is a complete Church, with full authority to exercise discipline, and to appoint a ministry. (4) Every believer is a real and true priest unto God, as much as any minister of any Church³.

The speaker declared that Baptists hold three of these principles in common with Congregationalists and that union with them should be the easiest to achieve. With Presbyterians and Methodists there is a

¹ ERNEST A. PAYNE, *The Fellowship of Believers* (London : The Carey Kingsgate Press, 1952), pp. 142-147.

² E. Y. MULLINS, *The Axioms of Religion* (Philadelphia : American Baptist Publication Society, 1908), p. 232.

³ Baptist World Alliance, *Fifth Baptist World Congress, Berlin, August 4-10, 1934*, J. H. Rushbrooke, ed. (London : Baptist World Alliance, 1934), p. 173.

difference of church order, for they do not accept the autonomy of the local assembly as Baptists do, but this presents no insuperable obstacle, since church polity in this respect is capable of modification, and indeed is experiencing change. The great difficulty in union with any of these groups would lie in the matter of baptism:

What non-Baptists very generally fail to realise is that Baptists are the declared foes of infant baptism in all its meanings and non-meanings, and can never make any terms whatever with the practice...

...I see no way of uniting with those who cling to infant baptism, and equate that rite with scriptural baptism¹.

The possibilities of union with the Episcopalians, said Mr. Laws, are even more remote, since it could probably occur only by the abandonment of all four of the distinctive Baptist principles. His conclusion was that the Baptists of the world at that time should concentrate their efforts upon unity among themselves.

Still, union of Baptists with other communions has taken place on a limited scale. In 1940-1941, German Baptists united with the BFC (Federation of Free-Church Christians — Darbists and Open Brethren) and the Elim group (who emphasize spiritual gifts) to form the Federation of Evangelical Free-Church Congregations (Bund Evangelisch-Freikirchlicher Gemeinden). Thus the name "Baptist" was sacrificed, but there was no sacrifice of believers' baptism, nor indeed of any of the four principles set forth by Gilbert Laws. The union has been only partially successful, for those of the BFC tradition are less willing to accept church organization and a regular ministry than are those of the Baptist tradition, and there are doubtless differences of theology also. Many of the non-Baptist congregations have left the Federation in recent years. Probably the union would not have taken place except for indirect pressure from the government.

In 1944 Russian Baptists united with the Evangelical Christians to form the Union of Evangelical Christian-Baptists. As a matter of fact, both groups were essentially Baptist and were members of the Baptist World Alliance but had been separate because of a different origin and different leadership. In 1945 the Pentecostalists were admitted to the Union after agreeing to refrain from the use of "other tongues" in general prayer meetings and from the propagation of their views

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 174-175.

among other believers¹. There was obviously no sacrifice of principle on the part of the Baptists.

Baptists are now involved in negotiations for church union in Ceylon and also in North India and Pakistan. Some feel that the Baptist witness can be continued in the united churches, but others fear that it will be lost. The Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan has been prepared by a committee representing Baptists, Brethren, Disciples, the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon (Anglican), two Methodist bodies, and the United Church of Northern India. It is now being considered by the churches. Baptists would apparently sacrifice convictions on the following points: (1) There are to be bishops. (2) Sacraments will be administered only by ordained ministers. (3) All ministers will at the Inauguration of the Union receive a laying on of hands by representative ministers of other churches, and this, though declared not to be reordination, looks rather much like it. (4) Infant baptism and believers' baptism are alternative practices, though admission to communicant membership will take place only upon evidence of repentance, faith, and love towards Christ. If any one baptized in infancy wishes to be rebaptized, he will be discouraged by his minister and then the matter will be referred to the bishop for pastoral advice and direction. If Baptists enter the Union they will insist upon including a Declaration of Principle as an appendix². Even so many Baptists in other parts of the world would regret Baptist participation. They would applaud recognition of the church as a fellowship of believers but would on several other points find agreement exceedingly difficult.

II

Membership in councils of churches is easier for Baptists, as for other Christians, than is church union. Baptists have been active in the establishment and development of local and national councils of churches. British Baptists, for example, in their reply to the Lambeth Appeal in 1926 stated:

We believe that the time has come when the Churches of Christ should unite their forces to meet the need of the world. We therefore are prepared

¹ ALEXANDER KAREV, "The Union of Evangelical Christian-Baptists in the U.S.S.R. and Its Work," *The Fraternal*, October, 1955.

² *Plan of Church Union in North India and Pakistan* (Madras: The Christian Literature Society, 1957); and LESLIE WINGER, "Will Baptists Join New Union Church?" *The Baptist Times*, September 12, 1957, p. 8.

to join the Church of England in exploring the possibility of a federation of equal and autonomous Churches in which the several parts of the Church of Christ would co-operate in bringing before men the will and the claims of our Lord¹.

British Baptists have taken a prominent part in the Free-Church Council and the British Council of Churches. Other Baptist bodies have participated in similar organizations.

In some quarters, however, there has been hesitancy to take part in councils of churches, and from the beginning Baptists have differed as to whether or not they should participate in the World Council of Churches. In the Baptist World Congress of 1939, W. O. Carver, in giving the results of a questionnaire, showed this division of opinion :

Unanimity is lacking in responses concerning advantages and disadvantages of the World Council of Churches. . . . For the most part Baptists are able to appreciate the important services which such a Council may serve, always provided that the Council does not interpret itself as an ecclesiastical union and does not lend itself to the promotion of a centrally dominated Christian organization with supervision over the creeds and conduct of the free churches of Jesus Christ. The cultivation of the spirit of unity and the comparison of experiences, ideas and judgments of the Christian churches in all the varying environments of the world may well serve to promote a larger fellowship, a deeper sense of the living presence of the Spirit of God, and the legitimate and necessary influence of Christianity upon ideologies, movements and agencies in the making of national and world history.

Our responses indicate that Baptists have definite and reasoned fears that membership in the World Council would probably be embarrassing. First, because we should be associated with representatives of churches which discount the convictions and practices of Baptists. Second, some of these churches are actively engaged in the persecution of Baptists, and in efforts to hinder their growth, in some cases to destroy their existence in given areas. [Persecution was severe in Rumania at that time]. . . . Third, because the hierarchical and sacramentarian concepts of influential members of the Council, clashing so radically with Baptist understanding, would make difficult sympathetic approach to many questions likely to come before the Council.

On the other hand, there are those who feel that it would be better for Baptists to enter the Council with clear understanding of the terms and conditions of our membership ; and with the purpose, in the fullest possible Christian fellowship, to make our contribution toward the right

¹ PAYNE, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

understanding of the Christian gospel and of the church, and to unite with all bodies represented in the Council in the largest feasible cooperation in seeking to solve the problems and discharge the tasks of the churches in the world. Baptists must feel keenly the sense of division in the Christian following and the separation, which history has largely forced upon us, from others of the children of God in Christ Jesus. We should earnestly desire to promote "the unity of spirit in the bond of peace," and to promote the fullest possible witness to all mankind of the fullness of the grace of God¹.

Ten Baptist bodies have joined the World Council of Churches. Four are American: the American (Northern) Baptist Convention, the National Baptist Convention of America and the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Incorporated (both composed of negroes), and the small Seventh Day Baptist Conference. Four are European: the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, the Baptist Union of the Netherlands, the Baptist Union of Denmark, and the Hungarian Baptist Union (admitted last year). The Baptists of China and New Zealand also have membership in the World Council of Churches. That Baptists are more than observers is indicated by the fact that Ernest A. Payne, of Great Britain, is vice-chairman of the Central Committee.

The largest of Baptist bodies, the Southern Baptist Convention, has not joined the World Council of Churches. Its Foreign Mission Board was for many years a member of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, but the Convention never joined the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America or its successor, the National Council (partly because of suspicion of the theology of some of the leaders), and when the Foreign Missions Conference was absorbed in the National Council the Southern Baptist Foreign Mission Board withdrew. When the Interchurch World Movement of North America invited Southern Baptists to join it in 1919, the invitation was declined. The President of the Convention said, "Baptists never ride a horse without a bridle," and "You cannot unite two bushes by tying their tops together."² As a matter of fact, the ambitious schemes of the Interchurch World Movement and its spectacular failure made Southern Baptists suspicious of interchurch cooperation. Another factor in the growing isolationism of Southern Baptists was the government policy during the first World

¹ Baptist World Alliance, *Sixth Baptist World Congress, Atlanta, Georgia, U.S.A., July 22-28, 1939* (Atlanta: Baptist World Alliance, 1939), pp. 131 f.

² BARNES, *op. cit.*, p. 283.

War and since of classifying all military chaplains as Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish. Pushed towards union with other Protestants, Southern Baptists reacted in the opposite direction.

In 1940, the Southern Baptist Convention replied as follows to an invitation to join the World Council of Churches:

... We would express to you our sincere and grateful appreciation for the courtesy and Christian spirit expressed in your communication. Directly replying to your invitation, permit us to advise that the Southern Baptist Convention is a voluntary association of Baptists for the purpose of eliciting, combining and directing the energies of our denomination in missionary activity at home and abroad, and in educational and benevolent work throughout the world. Our Convention has no ecclesiological authority. It is in no sense the Southern Baptist Church. The thousands of churches to which our Convention looks for support of its missionary, benevolent and educational program, cherish their independence and would disapprove of any attempted exercise of ecclesiastical authority over them.

In a world which more and more seeks centralization of power in industry, in civic government, and in religion, we are sensible of the danger of totalitarian trends that threaten the autonomy of all free churches. We wish to do nothing that will imperil the growing spirit of cooperation on the part of our churches in the work of giving the gospel of Christ, as we understand it, to all men everywhere. In the light of these considerations, we feel impelled to decline the invitation to membership in the World Council of Churches.

In conclusion, permit us to express the sincere desire of our hearts that the followers of Christ may all be one, not necessarily in name and in a world organization, but in spiritual fellowship with the Father and the Son. If Christ dwells in all our hearts by faith, we shall be brought into a spiritual unity that cannot be broken. We invoke the blessings of the triune God upon all who name the name of our Lord Jesus Christ¹.

Thus the Southern Baptist Convention, since it is a convention and not a church, declined membership in the World Council of Churches. Note the emphasis on belief in local church autonomy and opposition to centralization (congregational polity versus membership in the World Council), and the unwillingness to do anything which might hinder cooperation among Southern Baptists. Certainly there is among Southern Baptists a genuine suspicion of great ecclesiastical organizations, and there is an earnest conviction that unity does not depend upon membership in ecumenical organizations. Uneasiness appears whenever a few

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 286.

people are in a position to speak for many. Many Southern Baptists apparently fear that participation in the World Council would weaken the Baptist witness. Some feel that members of the Council have too little in common for effective cooperation to be possible, or, on the other hand that it is dominated by persons of an unacceptable theological position; and some suspect that the World Council is a half-way house to church union — a union on a basis unacceptable to Baptists, and a union which would be a super-church. Recently an editorial in *The Christian Century* argued that the one object of the ecumenical movement is organic union and that it should be left to those who “acknowledge its central meaning in Christ and intend to follow that meaning to its end in organic union.”¹

Some Southern Baptists, and many Baptists of other sections, are heartily in favour of membership in the World Council of Churches. In their opinion, Baptists need the experience of active membership in the ecumenical movement. It will broaden their horizons, deepen their sympathies, increase their understanding, and safeguard them against provincialism and sectarianism. Furthermore, the ecumenical movement needs Baptists. It will not be fully ecumenical without them, and unless their witness is heard fundamental Christian principles may be overlooked. Baptists can exert an influence on the inside of the World Council of Churches which they could never have on the outside. They should be in a position to help prevent the growth of a super-church or the triumph of an unacceptable theology (which, after all, is most unlikely in view of the present varied membership). Many Baptists believe also that the obligation to a needy world demands that they take advantage of the opportunities of fellowship and common witness with other Christians offered by the World Council of Churches.

A Southern Baptist has recently written concerning his communion :

With specific reference to our participation in the World Council of Churches : It is obvious that there is nothing distinctively Baptist to prevent it. Numerous other Baptist conventions or Unions are able to cooperate on terms which threaten neither our doctrine nor our polity. We could, on principle, cooperate — in such a way as to jeopardize none of our principles, and without construing our Convention as a Church.

¹ “Cut-Flower Ecumenicity,” *The Christian Century*, November 13, 1957, pp. 1343 f.

But for various reasons and convictions, as well as prejudices and fears, we have refrained, and probably will continue to refrain, from participation¹.

One further question remains. What is the position of the Baptist World Alliance with regard to the World Council of Churches? There was an address on "Baptists and the World Council of Churches" in the 1947 Baptist World Congress. The speaker declared:

This World Council of Churches is designed to bring our Christian forces together so that together we may face our worldwide task... Anything that will promote the Saviour's glory; anything that will bring men and women in all the lands into the Kingdom of His love; anything that will bind Christian hearts together in a united effort to save this unhappy world from sin and shame, should have our hearty approval, and, therefore, I am all for exploring to the full this question of co-operation with our fellow-Christians through the World Council of Churches².

This point of view was vigorously opposed. The President ruled that any motion for the Baptist World Alliance to join the World Council of Churches was out of order. The reasons were that the "Alliance may in no way interfere with the independence of the Churches or assume the administrative functions of existing organizations" and that the World Council of Churches is composed of national and not international bodies.

Baptists are therefore divided as to the desirability of membership in the World Council of Churches. The great majority of them, however, are genuinely concerned for the spiritual unity of Christians everywhere. That was the concern of John Smyth in the seventeenth century when he wrote that "all penitent and faithful Christians are brethren in the communion of the outward church, wheresoever they live, by what name soever they are known."³

¹ THERON D. PRICE, "The Nature of the Unity We Seek: A Southern Baptist View," *Religion in Life*, Spring, 1957, p. 206.

² *Seventh Baptist World Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, July 29 - August 3, 1947* (London, 1947), p. 57.

³ PAYNE, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

THE CHURCHES PLAN THEIR FUTURE IN METROPOLITAN CHICAGO

by

JOHN W. HARMS

The Protestant and Orthodox-Catholic churches of metropolitan Chicago are in the midst of a vast new urban frontier, at one of the most strategic and significant geographical crossroads in the world. The record of how they have responded to this challenge is a thrilling and inspiring story of ecumenical togetherness. Furthermore it promises to be a significant and pioneer contribution to the solution of one of the churches' most baffling modern problems: What must the churches do to make their mission effective in a modern metropolitan population centre?

This question is urgent today because the movement of population in America is definitely toward an urban orientation. 60% of the nation's population in 1950 lived in urban areas compared with 20% in 1860. The great metropolitan centers are still growing rapidly, so rapidly that they have become critical mission and church extension areas. These new urban frontiers are as vast and significant for American Christianity as was the western frontier for the churches in the 19th century.

I

There are few industrial centres in the nation or the world where the urbanization process has proceeded with more consistent speed or intensity than in metropolitan Chicago.

When Chicago was incorporated as a town in 1837 it had a population of about four thousand. By 1950, a little more than a century later, the four-county metropolitan commuting area had a population of approximately five million people. Competent authorities, including the Federation's own Bureau of Research and Planning, predict a population of 7,300,000 by 1970, an increase of 2,300,000 over 1950.

This great increase in population is the result of dynamic social and economic forces in the nation's life, which converge upon Chicago because of its strategic geographical location. New industrial and commercial developments are taking place on a widely diversified scale in response to these forces. The most recent and spectacular are the creation of the modern Calumet Harbor (on Lake Michigan), and the widening and deepening of the Cal-Sag canal, connecting water link with the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico. These developments, made possible by the St. Lawrence Seaway which will be completed in 1960, promise to make Chicago one of the largest inland ports in the world. The new commercial and industrial ventures associated with these improved waterway facilities alone will make an estimated 400,000 jobs available soon (some authorities say as many as a million and a half ultimately). This means families and homes with at least a million people, perhaps many more, in the Chicago area.

In 1950 fifty-four percent of metropolitan Chicago's population, or 2,700,000 people, were a direct moral and spiritual responsibility of Protestant churches. Add to this about 150,000 Orthodox and some other Catholic bodies and the Protestant and Orthodox-Catholic churches of metropolitan Chicago were responsible for the moral and spiritual welfare of 2,850,000 people. In the 20 years, 1950-70, the Protestant and Orthodox-Catholic portion of the increase in population will rise to at least 60 % because the great in-migration now is over-whelmingly Protestant, not Roman Catholic as it was up to 1920. This means that the number of people for whom these churches will be responsible will increase by an estimated 1,400,000. By 1970 their "parish" will consist of approximately 4,250,000 people, i. e., people whose basic orientation is to a Protestant or Orthodox-Catholic religious heritage.

II

How is the mission of the churches to be defined in this kind of dynamic population situation with its many difficult, complex problems? How do they meet such vast and expanding responsibilities at the metropolitan level, i. e., through conference, classis, association, presbytery, synod, diocese and/or local church?

The research data which have been such an important factor in the analysis of these problems disclosed an alarming story about the churches' failure to evangelize this urban and suburban population as effectively as the churches are actually doing in the nation as a whole.

In 1955 Protestant churches in the nation reached 47% of the total *Protestant and non-church* portion of the population (i. e., after removing the Roman Catholic, Jewish, Orthodox, Old Catholic, Polish National Catholic memberships and some small non-Christian groups). If the churches in metropolitan Chicago had done as well they should have at least 1,400,000 members in their congregations. The record shows, however, a scant 800,000 members leaving an enormous deficit of about 600,000 members, a deficit which can only be interpreted as a measure of the churches' failure to serve as successfully in metropolitan Chicago as they have in the less urbanized areas of the nation during the last hundred years. Statistics do not tell the whole story, of course, but they are one standard of measurement which cannot be ignored. Such a glaring contrast between performance in a metropolitan area and in the nation as a whole must induce the most vigorous kind of self-examination, and this is what has been happening among and within the churches.

The story of how the churches have come to realize their predicament really began in 1907 when they organized The Church Federation of Greater Chicago. This was their first step toward official togetherness in response to the ecumenical vision. The motivation for this move was in considerable part a sense of inadequacy in the face of a growing metropolitan area, and the conviction that together the churches could do something about it. However, the real start toward a significantly new creative approach to their problem was made in 1949 when seven cooperating bodies within the Federation joined in financing a research unit. These ten years or more of research (the unit was organized on a part-time basis in 1943) have produced the data and their interpretation which have enabled understanding and insight to emerge which heretofore was not available. A full account of these results is properly not the purpose of this article. However, one insight has emerged with the impact of an atomic explosion.

In the future there must be systematic and cooperative planning for Christian institutions and programs in metropolitan Chicago if the churches are to have a significant place in its life. They must plan their own future at least as intelligently as business, education, industry and government are planning theirs, and they must do so together.

Business organizations, city, village, township, county and state agencies (sometimes with assistance of the federal government) are all engaged in steady, often feverish, activity to provide the physical facilities

that are needed by the rapidly increasing population. Factories, office buildings, homes, schools, sewers, water mains, new improved super highways, rapid metropolitan transportation facilities—all of these are in varying stages of planning or actual construction, the aggregate value of which runs into the billions of dollars.

Suburban expansion will be the signature of the future in metropolitan Chicago. However, urban Chicago is in the midst of a "renaissance" or 'renewal program which in the next few decades promises to eliminate 23 square miles of slum housing, and to prevent another 56 square miles of housing from becoming slums. These two critical areas comprise 55 % of all dwellings in Chicago and approximately 2,000,000 people live in them. The city's long-range plans for these areas promise to transform them into some of Chicago's most desirable residential sections within 15 to 30 years.

The dominant and perhaps most significant characteristic of all this activity is conscious and ever more highly developed planning processes by governmental and private agencies. These are essential but they lead to an ever-tightening control over the way land is to be used, which has ominous implications for the churches unless they are equipped with plans for their own future land-use requirements.

III

The Bureau's population studies have made it clear that the churches' plans for the future must include large provision for the establishment of congregations in new and growing communities in Chicago suburbs. For several years now, especially in the last three, denominational church extension officials have been working on the development of a "Master Plan for Suburban Church Extension." The basic work on the first draft of such a plan has been completed for about 70 % of the area and will be finished for all suburban areas early in 1959. The research process, carefully checked and validated by practical and experienced church extension executives, has indicated that in the next 20 to 30 years there is a probable need for 593 new congregations in the 70 % of the area for which the research and planning process has been completed. One hundred and thirty-one of these focal points, i. e., locations for new churches, should be started at once or in the near future, because a significant number of people already live in these communities and the prospect for additional growth is good, as known

residential development plans indicate that people will soon be living in them. Sites for an additional 180 focal points should be purchased at once in order to guarantee that there will be a place for churches when needed in the next three to five years. When the first draft of the Master Plan has been completed early in 1959 it will probably indicate that something over 750 new churches will be needed in the next 20 to 30 years.

Very careful analysis and planning enter into the process of developing the Master Plan. On the basis of these studies potential congregations are spaced in such a way that each should have an opportunity to achieve a minimum membership even under adverse circumstances¹ of five or six hundred members. In communities where conditions are most favourable the membership may reach 1500 or even 2,000 or more. The *median* membership of the local church, i. e., 50% larger than the median and 50% smaller, is expected to be 800 to 1,000 "adult" or communicant members.

When the Master Plan for a particular sector (usually a cluster of communities in a region or area; the suburban Chicago area has been divided into eleven sectors for research and planning purposes) has been completed it is first of all a long-range church extension plan for each participating denomination in which each proposed location for a church is properly related by distance and other factors to other proposed sites or existing congregations of the same denomination. Secondly, the proposed sites are each properly related to the sites and existing congregations of other denominations. Therefore they comprise a "Master Plan for Suburban Church Extension" for the cooperating bodies, or the first draft of a blueprint for cooperative and economical church extension reaching into the future; five, ten, twenty or even thirty years. Each denomination is responsible for its own assignments, and if adjustments are necessary because of changing or unforeseen conditions, provision has been made in the Master Plan for them to be made by agreement among the cooperating denominations.

When the Master Plan for Suburban Church Extension has been completed, every square acre of the developing suburbs will be a responsibility of some denomination and as soon as need arises it will give whatever service is appropriate. The congregations that will develop

¹ i. e., where there is an unusually high Roman Catholic or Jewish concentration of population, or where the community fails to develop its maximum population potential.

within this frame of reference will each have the largest possible opportunity for growth into a strong community-serving local church. At the same time the congregations together will provide the leadership and facilities for the maximum penetration of the population without wasteful competition among the cooperating denominations, first of all because of the proximity of the congregations to the people, and secondly because of the strong appeal that a rich variety of denominational backgrounds will make to the people of a given area.

IV

As has been pointed out the suburbs are not the only needy areas in metropolitan Chicago. In fact, the areas of most critical need and most difficult problems are in urban Chicago, i. e., within the city limits plus a few of the adjacent older suburban communities. The Bureau of Research and Planning has done four man-years of research in this area but it is only the beginning of what has to be done in order to assemble the information and provide adequately for its interpretation.

The Bureau is now organizing a special three-year "crash" program of research and planning for this purpose. It will provide the basis for the creation of a "Master Plan for Development and Expansion of Church Life in Urban Chicago," which will be for the city proper what its companion long-range plan is designed to be for suburban Chicago.

The most massive church problem in urban Chicago is related to the vast slum clearance and neighbourhood conservation programs of the city to which reference has already been made. This renewal of housing together with the development of a network of new high speed auto expressways is changing the basic pattern and character of the city. The time is at hand when the most desirable residential areas of metropolitan Chicago may not be found in the suburbs but in what are at the moment the least desirable slum areas. The churches are now in the process of making a completely new approach to the inner city which until recently has been considered to be a lost opportunity for Protestant church life.

Another special but very large problem has to do with the life and work of the churches that are or must be related to the newer in-migration groups, particularly the negroes. For example, preliminary research

has uncovered such facts as these: 75% of the church buildings now occupied by negro congregations are 50 to 75 years old. Furthermore, these buildings, originally built for white congregations which seldom served as much as one half of the population in their communities, (sometimes only a small percentage), are now called upon to serve 90% or more of a greatly expanded Protestant negro population. It must be realized, too, that most of these buildings were not adequate for a vital church programme even at the time they were built; in the main they may be characterized as rural churches transplanted to an urban centre and wholly inadequate to meet the needs of urban men. They were not designed to provide the kind of full-rounded educational, recreational and worship experience that is now recognized as essential for urban church leadership.

This situation calls for the development of a vast programme for rehabilitation and expansion of church buildings in urban Chicago. Programme must be reconstructed. Leadership must be enlisted and sometimes re-trained. Preliminary research indicates that at least 300 local churches which do not have access to adequate denominational resources will need an average of \$ 50,000 in revolving loan funds over the next 20 years in order to carry out this plant and programme rehabilitation. Probably 600 local churches in all must reorganize their programme and facilities if they are to serve the increasing number of Protestant people now coming into the city. One major objective is to help these churches increase in size to a median membership of 600 to 800. At present the median size is 325 which is entirely too small a congregation for strong leadership and services under urban conditions.

V

The churches' plans for the future are not confined to the church extension activities outlined above. In fact, their vision of the long-range future, specifically covering the next twenty years, is a well-planned programme with four major objectives and seventeen specific projects. Objective number one has to do with the expansion and development of the churches' life, which involves the church extension activities outlined above but also includes a great deal more. Altogether five specific projects are related to this objective: evangelism, Christian education, increasing the size and strength of a thousand local churches, the organization of a service agency to help local churches especially

in urban Chicago, churches which are without adequate denominational resources ; and the two Master Plans for church extension and development that have already been mentioned, one for the suburbs and the other for urban Chicago. The hope is that these plans will help make the churches so evangelistically effective that they will attract a net increase of 600,000 members in the next 20 years. This will barely keep the churches' membership in proportion to the expected population increase.

A second major objective is to expand and develop the churches' witness and service to the community, to which five specific projects are related. These include the development of local community inter-church cooperation in the local community areas in metropolitan Chicago, adequate social welfare services, community leadership for a responsible social order, the effective use of radio and television, and a long-range and united program of pastoral services to the sick and unfortunate in the nearly 100 hospitals and other institutions of care ; a special four point emphasis on the relationship of religion to health in the strategic Illinois Medical Center, largest of its kind in the world.

Each of these projects is being developed into a long-range program of action designed to help the churches to be vigorous community-serving agencies which will meet the moral and spiritual needs as well as the social and physical needs of people.

The third major objective is related to the churches' need for adequate lay and professional leadership. Two projects centre in these needs. It is anticipated that the volunteer lay staff of the churches will have to be increased by thirty to fifty thousand people. These must be enlisted and trained within the local churches but with assistance at the denominational and interdenominational or interchurch levels. Also the Federation is sharing in the emerging Evanston Institute of Ecumenical Studies which should make an indispensable contribution to the development of a competent lay churchmanship.

It is estimated now that in the next 20 years the "professional staff" of the Churches must be increased by the addition of 2,000 professional leaders (ministers, associates, directors of Christian education, lay administrators and social workers). This is a responsibility of the seminaries but they will be given the larger backing and support from the churches which they will need to do this job.

The last objective, number four, has to do with the inner strength of the churches' life and the symbols of their unity. Four specific projects

will be needed for its accomplishment. A steady emphasis on stewardship and wide use of the very successful eight-step every member canvass through the United Stewardship Canvass project will be a major part of the total Master Plan in local churches. Other projects are in the area of publicity and public relations, cultivation of a Protestant and Orthodox-Catholic philanthropy as a positive answer to the drift toward a secularized philanthropy and the creation of a United Churches Centre or headquarters as a base of operation for the churches in metropolitan Chicago.

Together these four major objectives and the seventeen specific projects comprise an overall "Master Plan" designed to provide an answer to the baffling problem of how the churches can effectively serve this great metropolitan area. It is popularly known as the New Chicago Spiritual Goals programme.

* * *

Chicago leaders look upon these New Chicago Spiritual Goals as an overall plan for the physical and programme facilities needed by the churches to keep up with the dynamic expansion that is taking place in this great urban centre. They know that this planning will have to be revised constantly to meet changing conditions, and as experience is gained in such an operation. They are prepared to make revisions and to expect that mistakes will be made which if possible will have to be corrected.

These leaders of the churches are together in seeing metropolitan Chicago as a great new urban frontier, which will take the vision, the daring and the sharing practised in the earlier home mission enterprise which planted and developed churches of Christ in frontier communities across the American continent in the 19th century. There will be one important and striking difference, however. The 19th century enterprise was often very competitive in spirit and wasteful in practice. The 20th century mission is being undertaken by those who are participating in its conception in the ecumenical spirit of cooperation and unity.

THE CONCERT FOR PRAYER FOR MISSIONS

An Early Venture in Ecumenical Action

by

R. PIERCE BEAVER

Christian unity, expressed in varying forms of interdenominational and international association, has been a characteristic of the foreign missionary enterprise from its very beginning among Protestants. The interdenominational character of the London Missionary Society is often cited as evidence of this fact. However, long before that last decade of the eighteenth century a bond of unity in devotion to the common cause had drawn together those who were concerned about the proclamation of the Gospel to the heathen. Thus it was that Increase Mather of Boston and Johan Leusden of Utrecht exchanged news about missions in the "East Indies" and "West Indies." Anton Wilhelm Boehm, chaplain to the Prince of Denmark, Consort of Queen Anne, at London drew into a warm fellowship the directors of the SPCK, August Herman Francke of Halle, the missions officers at Copenhagen, the Tranquebar missionaries, Cotton Mather at Boston, and the American missionaries to the Indians. Directly and through Boehm, Francke and Mather exchanged letters and books, and Mather sent gifts of gold towards support of the various Hallensian enterprises.

One of the most important instances of interdenominational and international collaboration is the movement known as the Concert for Prayer. More than anything else it broadened the horizon for British and American churchmen and for many in Europe, and it brought the whole *oikoumene* with its vast nations of heathen peoples within the view and concern of Protestant Christians. This view of the whole world, along with common prayer for the coming of the Kingdom of God, was exceedingly influential in stimulating a new obedience to the Great Commission. And then when the missionary societies had come into being, the Concert for Prayer provided spiritual power, assisted in raising funds, and served as an effective instrument of missionary education.

Scottish Origin

Some ministers in the autumn of 1744 issued a general call to the churches in Scotland proposing a scheme of united effort in public prayers for the coming of the Kingdom of God. They were convinced : ¹

that the providence of God at such a day, did loudly call upon such as were concerned for the welfare of Sion, to *united extraordinary* applications to the God of all grace, that he would *appear in his glory*, and favour Zion, and manifest his compassion to the world of mankind, by an abundant affusion of his *Holy Spirit* on all the churches and the whole habitable earth, to revive true religion in all parts of *Christendom*, and to deliver *all nations* from their great and manifold spiritual calamities, and bless them with the unspeakable benefits of the Kingdom of our glorious Redeemer, and *fill the whole earth with his glory*.

This conviction led them to make the proposal concerning which they now issued their circular letter. The ministers called upon all who would collaborate with them to set apart for the next two years some time on Saturday evening and Sunday morning for united intercession and supplication, and especially to devote all or part of the first Tuesday of each quarter to this purpose. Individuals might privately join in the common action; but it was especially desired that private praying societies would participate and that public meetings might be held.

It is reported that there was a very good response to the appeal in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen, Dundee, and other towns where the praying societies of youth especially took up the proposal with enthusiasm. Thirty such young people's prayer societies were established in Edinburgh, and Glasgow with forty-five appears to have been even more zealous ². The experiment seemed so successful that at the end of the two years twelve ministers printed, under date of August 26, 1746, a memorial entitled *A Concert For Prayer, To Be Continued For Seven Years*. This was distributed through Scotland and England, and five hundred copies were sent to America ³. The movement then spread

¹ All accounts of the origin of the movement appear to be based on the report given by Jonathan Edwards in Part I, Section III ("An Historical Account of the Concert to which the Memorial Relates") of his *An Humble Attempt*. See note 7 below. The quotation here is from the edition of that work in *The Works Of Jonathan Edwards, A.M.*, 10th edition. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1865; Vol. II, p. 282.

² Edwards cites a letter of the Rev. Mr. Robe of Kilsyth to the Rev. Thomas Prince of Boston, dated Nov. 3, 1743.

³ This "Memorial" is preserved by Edwards' inclusion of it in *An Humble Attempt*, as Section IV of Part I.

in Scotland, England, Wales, Ireland, and America, according to information received by Mr. Prince in Boston¹.

The Contribution of Jonathan Edwards

The Atlantic in the mid-seventeenth century did not isolate spiritually and intellectually the American Colonies from Great Britain. Books, tracts, and letters kept the colonial clergy and intelligentsia in close touch with the currents of thought in England and Scotland. A writer of the stature of Jonathan Edwards received a wider reading in the mother country than in America. Henry Rogers was not exaggerating when he stated: "Though far removed from the ancient seats of learning, Edwards had spoken in a voice which has echoed through the halls of European science and philosophy, and has been listened to with respect by their profoundest masters of wisdom."² The Northampton pastor was engaged in theological discussion through correspondence with many of the most noted divines of the period in Scotland. They sent one another also much general news about public affairs and the religious situation. Among Edward's correspondents were all the signers of the memorial. It is not surprising that they sent a copy to their American friend and to the pastors of the churches in Boston. The Boston clergymen then commended the practice to the American churches.

The proposed Concert captured the imagination of Jonathan Edwards. He wrote to a correspondent in Scotland, the Rev. William McCulloch: "I have taken a great deal of pains to promote this concert here in America, and shall not cease to do so, if God spares my life, if I have opportunity, in all ways I can devise."³ The most effective means which he devised was to write a book, *An Humble Attempt To Promote Explicit Agreement And Visible Union Among God's People, In Extraordinary Prayer For The Revival of Religion, And The Advancement of Christ's Kingdom On Earth, Pursuant To Scripture Promises, And Prophecies Concerning The Last Time*⁴. The contents of this volume had first been preached by Edwards to his congregation at Northampton,

¹ Note to *An Humble Attempt*, Part I, Sec. IV; Works, Vol. II, p. 284.

² "An Essay on the Genius and Writings of Jonathan Edwards," by Henry Rogers, in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards, A.M.*, Vol. I, p. xi (see note 1 above).

³ Letter quoted in "A Memoir of Jonathan Edwards," by Sereno Edwards Dwight, in *Works*, Vol. I, p. cxxxiii.

⁴ First published by D. Hinchman in Boston, 1747. A complete edition will be found in *Works*, Vol. II, p. 278-312.

Massachusetts, and then edited into a book. Five of the ministers of Boston signed the preface¹. Published on both sides of the Atlantic, the work exerted a profound influence.

The author based his argument for a vast scheme of united prayer by Christians everywhere on an exposition of Zechariah 8:20-22: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, it shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities; and the inhabitants of one city shall go unto another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the Lord, and to seek the Lord of hosts. I will go also. Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the Lord." This chapter contained a prophecy of a future glorious advancement of the Church which has not yet come to pass and which would be the final and greatest time of increase. This glorious age of Zion's prosperity would be introduced by the common action of many Christians in making "a *joint resolution*, and coming into an express and *visible agreement*, that they will by united and extraordinary *prayer*, seek to God, that he would come and manifest himself, and grant the tokens and fruits of his gracious presence." This extraordinary effort in prayer includes more than normal public worship. Multitudes of Christians in every part of the world, visibly united in an explicit agreement, must make supplication for God's gracious presence and communion. As the people of Christ act and this prayer circle spreads, there may be expected a revival of religion.

Moreover, this concert for prayer is not to be a nebulous movement in which interested individuals join personally and in private prayer only. It must be a visible union, according to the Scriptures, formed by an explicit agreement and demonstrated publicly. All who participate need to manifest the utmost earnestness, and they must pray continuously and unceasingly. "This union in such prayer is foretold as a *becoming* and *happy* thing, that would be acceptable to God, and attended with glorious success."

Jonathan Edwards in this little book sought to show that the "latter-day glory" had not yet come at this point in history, and that its coming awaited such united action in prayer by the people of God. Unlike others of the time who sought to explain the prophecies, he asserted

¹ Joseph Sewell, Thomas Prince, John Webb, Thomas Foxcraft, and Joshua Gee.

that the terrible time of the Church's trials and suffering was not still to come, but had already passed. The warfare was almost accomplished, in Edward's view, and the time of triumph nigh. Thus Edwards brought the Church, in popular expectation, to the dawn of the millenium, and made it possible for that millennial expectation to become a motive for mission at the end of that century. Two generations later it was asked why "our fathers, and especially President Edwards," prayed but did not act for the expansion of the Kingdom¹. (Edwards did serve as missionary to the Indians for six years at Stockbridge.) However, by advocating united action in prayer and relating this human offering to the action of God, he prepared the way also for that important motivation in American missions half a century later, the duty of being co-workers with God. Above all, he provided through this book a potent influence for common action during the next seventy-five years, and through his explanation of the prophecies of the coming Kingdom enlarged the horizon of rank-and-file church members, bringing into their prayerful concern and thinking all the unevangelized peoples of the earth.

One of the persons whom Jonathan Edwards interested in the Concert for Prayer was the famous missionary to the Indians, David Brainerd. When the young man lay dying in the Edwards home at Northampton; he expressed concern that the movement was not making a more rapid advance. He "sent it as his dying advice to his own congregation, that they should practice agreeably to that proposal."² His church at Crossweksung followed his advice willingly and fervently, and many a person later reading the *Life of Mr. David Brainerd* had his own interest in the movement kindled by that of the missionary. The Presbyterians of the Middle Colonies were closely associated with the Society in Scotland for Propagating Christian Knowledge in the support of Brainerd, and his death-bed request also had an effect among them. Edwards reported that "the Presbyteries of New York and New Brunswick . . . have with one consent, fallen in with the proposal, as likewise some others of God's peoples in those parts."³ From time to time the movement would take on new life. For example, the appearance

¹ BROWN, FRANCIS, *A Sermon*, Preached before the Maine Missionary Society, 1814; p. 12.

² EDWARDS, JONATHAN, *An Account of the Life of the Reverend David Brainerd* [edited by Samuel Austin], Worcester (Mass.): Leonard Worcester, 1793, p. 276.

³ *Ibid.*, see footnote.

of a new American edition of *An Humble Attempt* in 1794 lead some Connecticut ministers to propose to all Christian denominations a new attempt "to carry into execution the *Humble Attempt* of President Edwards," still adhering to the first Tuesday of the four quarters¹.

English Baptists Promote The Monthly Concert

Scottish and American churches and prayer groups in the early period appear largely to have followed the time schedule suggested in the original memorandum. There was greater variety in England. The next stage of the movement began in 1784, at Nottingham, when in the course of a meeting of the Association of Baptist Churches in Northampton and Leicester Counties it was resolved to establish "a meeting of prayer for the general revival and spread of religion," to be observed by all churches in the Association on the first Monday evening in each month². Two years later the Baptist Association of the Midlands also adopted the scheme. Then some non-baptist free churches followed their example. John Sutcliffe of Olney then brought out a new edition of Edward's *Humble Attempt* in order that it might stimulate this new phase of the movement, and this edition was then reprinted in America five years later³. This man was pastor of the church which William Carey joined after his baptism, and he was one of the ministers who ordained Carey. The Concert for Prayer undoubtedly helped to produce a climate favorable to the rise of the missionary societies in the last decade of the eighteenth century.

The LMS Makes The Concert Part of The Missionary Movement

The actual coupling of this powerhouse of the spirit with organized missionary endeavor on a large scale was the work of the London Missionary Society. Shortly after its founding in 1795, the directors of the Society recommended that the meeting commonly held on the first Monday night of each month be made a missionary prayer meeting⁴. The response in the London area was enthusiastic. The union

¹ Reported by William Linn, D. D., one of the ministers of the Reformed Dutch Church in New York City in his *Discourses On The Signs Of The Times*, N.Y.: Thomas Greenleaf, 1794; p. 174-175.

² JOHN SUTCLIFFE'S *Preface* to his edition of EDWARDS' *An Humble Attempt*, in *Works*, Vol. II, p. 278.

³ Northampton: 1789; Elizabethtown (N.J.): Shepard Kollock, 1794.

⁴ GEORGE BURDER'S *Preface* to the abridged edition of *An Humble Attempt*, entitled, *United Prayer For The Spread Of The Gospel*, p. 4; see note 18.

meeting was held in the several churches in succession, until soon attendance was too large for a single meeting place. The metropolitan region was then divided into four quarters and simultaneous meetings were held in each. The practice then spread to "all the principal cities and towns of the Kingdom," and to "Holland, Switzerland, Germany, America, India, Africa, and wherever there are any missionaries from the Societies in England." The programme consisted of an address, the reporting of news from the mission fields, and intercessory prayer. Moreover, the movement continued to gain strength. The *London Evangelical Magazine* in 1801 reported with pleasure that a large number of churches in the United Kingdom through the Monthly Concert joined "in fervent prayer to God for a blessing on the Gospel and those missionaries who are now engaged in the arduous undertaking of preaching the Gospel to the Indian nations."¹ Richard Furman, in his presidential address to the General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States in 1817, referred to God's blessing upon the action of the Northampton Association in initiating the Monthly Concert. He states that the practice has been generally adopted.²

Once again Jonathan Edwards was called upon to stoke the fires of zeal and faithfulness. The London Missionary Society in 1814 published an abridged edition of the *Humble Attempt* under the title: *United Prayer For The Spread Of The Gospel Earnestly Recommended*³. The secretary of the Society, George Burder, in the preface to the tract declared:

Thus an immense number of praying persons are engaged at the same hour in their supplications to the God of all grace, in behalf of a world lying in the Wicked One, and for the spread of that glorious gospel which is the power of God to human salvation; and thus the plan of union, which good Mr. Edwards so strongly recommended, is, in no inconsiderable degree, adopted in the Christian world.

There were variations in the plan from time to time as some organization attempted to adapt it specifically to its own purposes. Thus the New York Missionary Society, which was a union agency involving

¹ In an article, "Remarks on the Prophecies and Promises Relating to the Glory of the Latter Day," reprinted in the *New York Missionary Magazine*, Vol. II, No. 6 (1801), p. 452-453.

² *Proceedings of the General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States, First Triennial Meeting, Philadelphia, 1817, together with the Third Annual Report of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions*, p. 124.

³ London: R. Williams, 1814.

Presbyterians, Associate Reformed, Dutch Reformed, and Baptists, in 1798 summoned its members and friends on "the second Wednesday evening of every month, beginning at candlelight" to common prayer to "the God of grace, that he would be pleased to pour out his spirit on his Church, and send his gospel to all nations; and that he would succeed the endeavours of this Society, and all Societies instituted on the same principles, and for the same ends."¹ The Northern Missionary Society in the State of New York reverted to the older time schedule and called on its members to spend some time in prayer on the first Tuesday afternoon in each quarter². A similar concert of prayer for the welfare of the United States, including "a return of peace, a reformation of morals, and a general revival of religion," was proposed in 1815. A writer in *The Panoplist* stated that since the united Monthly Concert of Prayer on behalf of missionaries was so widely observed in Europe, America, and mission stations in Asia, it would be better to combine the new idea with the old, and on the first Monday night in each month hold meetings of prayer for the heathen, the nation, for all ministers of the gospel, for the rulers of every nation, and for all men³. He reported later that on March 15, 1815, "a large number of churches will commence the observance of this concert."⁴

The Monthly Concert was still a powerful instrument for missionary support and education in the decade of the 1820's. By that time lay groups and women's societies, which were often without the assistance of a minister, were observing the custom. The Rev. Enoch Pond of Ward, Massachusetts, sought to help such groups, as well as fellow pastors who were hard-pressed to produce a new missionary address every month, by publishing in a book a series of his own discourses at the monthly prayer meetings. It was called *Short Missionary Discourses, Or Monthly Concert Lectures*⁵. He sounds a call that went out repeatedly from the monthly meetings: Brethren, be consistent; *act*, as well as *pray*, for the coming of Christ's Kingdom! Saint Paul and David Brainerd prayed for the diffusion of the Gospel, but they also laboured, suffered, and sacrificed for it. "Of such persons, my friends, let us be the followers."

¹ *New York Missionary Magazine*, Vol. I, No. 1 (1800), p. 80-81.

² *Ibid.*, Vol. I, No. 2 (1800), p. 95-96.

³ *The Panoplist*, Vol. XI, No. 1 (January, 1815), p. 19-20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Vol. XI, No. 3 (March, 1815), p. 124.

⁵ Worcester (Mass.): Dorr and Howland (E. and G. Merrin, printers), 1824. See p. 110 for reference to action consistent with prayer.

SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTIONS

by

FREDERIK M. VAN ASBECK

I

An outstanding fact in our post-war world is the growing application of the representative principle in international organizations. We witness all kinds of experiments in that field, tending towards a combination of the traditional contacts of national governments with direct co-operation between the nations themselves—, and at the same time of course, towards organizing regular sustained co-operation on the *international* level between representatives of governments and of nations.

We meet with these experiments in various parts of our globe, at the present moment most of all in Europe, in Europe's regional organizations. The new institutions—a striking fact that we should note in passing—may now in retrospect be seen to have started in that bold venture begun in 1919, where in the International Labour Organization (not a regional but in intention a world-wide organization), delegates of governments sit on conferences and boards and committees, together with representatives of non-governmental professional organizations. This first experiment deserves our attention because it reveals that an international representative assembly needs a strong basis—, in the case of ILO founded on common social interests and aims.

In Europe we now find several regional representative "assemblies" or "councils," either for a relatively small or for a larger region. For a relatively small region there exist: The Northern Council of 1952 (the three Scandinavian countries, Finland, Iceland), the recently organized Benelux Council (3 countries) and the Assembly of the Western European Union (7 countries).

The Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe (15 countries) serves a larger region, whilst the Common Assembly of the European

Coal and Steel Community, though comprising no more than 6 countries, gives a striking example of an early parliamentary assembly in the international sphere. A first approach towards a representative NATO Assembly has already been made on an un-official basis. We must note the absence of any such representation in the Organization of American States. On the other hand a partly representative "conference" strikes our attention within the framework of the Caribbean Council and of the South Pacific Commission. It is proposed however to leave these last two "conferences" (West Indian Conference and South Pacific Conference) aside in the observations which follow and to confine the exposé to European representative bodies only. They will be indicated here, whatever their exact title, by the common denominator "assemblies."

Although the European assemblies differ *inter se* in composition and powers, they present some important common features. They are all of them composed of members drawn from the national parliaments (they have all adopted a parliamentary procedure); they are intended to act as directly representing their *region-as-a-whole* and not as a juxtaposition of national delegations representing their countries (such as is the case in the General Assembly of the United Nations), and to take care of common regional interests on the basis of their own merits and not through the prism of national judgements, interests and possibly prejudices. They contribute to bringing to light the true character of their region, as being not a loose society of states, but on the contrary a community of nations bound together by common interests and by common spiritual and moral values. All these bodies are no longer organized on the well-known traditional inter-governmental pattern but on the principle of supra-national federation. All of them — with one exception, viz. the Coal and Steel Assembly — are endowed with advisory powers only.

Why is this modern trend in international organizations so important, why does it demand our utmost attention?

II

It is one of the distinctive weaknesses of our present world-society (not community!) of states, now organized in the U.N. that it is largely, almost entirely, lacking in adequate institutions of such composition and powers as to enable them to take care of the common interests

of the nations on their own merits, from the viewpoint of the respective group of nations as a whole. As far as concerns the world-society of states, it could not be otherwise at the present moment, because our world-society is so badly integrated, however much the interests of independent nations may be entwined and inseparably linked up the one with the other; most of all because the world-society of states is lacking a common spiritual and moral basis, an international ethos, a common conviction concerning the relations of man, state and society of states, and concerning freedom and authority, law and power. The present exclusively intergovernmental organization leads the nations into the paradoxical situation that common interests are left to the care of ministers or other government officials or representatives, acting for those *international* interests in collaboration, each under *national* governmental instructions only, tied to their national cabinets who in turn are for these *international* interests, on the same footing as for purely national matters, responsible only to *national* parliaments or electorates or other bodies. In consequence of this fact, national governments are in their international functions dependent not on an international representative body but on separate national bodies only, each of which in its dealings and decisions is inspired and motivated first of all, or exclusively, by national considerations. National cabinets, ministries, and other bodies regard as their first task — it could not be otherwise — the defence of national interests and viewpoints, even if they are in conflict with international ones. This effect in its turn causes again the perpetuation of the weakness indicated above. The international interests of the nations, however, have become too important, too grave, too full of international consequence to be left to this parallel or conflicting handling by national representatives.

But — and here we are confronted with nearly insuperable obstacles — first of all there does not yet exist in the world-society of states a common measure of judgment, and second the means of enforcement of decisions and of safeguarding the existing international order lie exclusively in the hands of governments. In the Dutch language there exists a saying that Cologne and Aix-la-Chapelle have not been built in one day. When looking at the present organization of the world-society of states this saying or others to the same effect are apt to remind us, that we cannot alter the present unfortunate, weak and deadly dangerous situation by a stroke of a pen or by well considered abstract plans of a more or less visionary nature and purport.

For the time being, then, the world of states is still an impersonal world of primarily self-regarding national states, living mostly without a binding authority — save that of an imperfect, rather weak, insecure international law, but this is a law without strong organs for its maintenance, enforcement and further development. Decisions have mostly to be taken by voluntary adjustment of national interests or national viewpoints on the basis of relative power, because they cannot yet rest on a common ground of subservient obligation of the parts to the whole on the basis of weighing interests in a legal balance. In the world society of states we are still living in a *political order* —, this we should never lose sight of — whose ultimate aim needs must lie — surely in our atomic age — in the preservation of *peace*, where decisions are arrived at under the impact of diverging views and interests, of weak solidarity, suspicion and pressure from the great powers which bear major responsibility, and in the case of conflict will have to bear the brunt of the defence of the world. The present political order exists by the grace of a hierarchy of *power* only.

What we are hoping for, what we are striving at, is the attainment of a *legal order*, the ultimate aim of which should be the maintenance of *law* and *justice*, where decisions would be arrived at under the impact of the sense of common responsibility for the well-being of the nations as a whole, where the rule of law would maintain a hierarchy of *values*, underscored by power put in the service of law and justice.

III

The foregoing considerations, much too short in relation to the importance of the subject, and somewhat simplified for convenience of exposition, contain the answer to the question put at the conclusion of the first section above. The answer comes down to the view that the regional representative organisms contain a possibility of breaking through, gradually and with circumspection, the barriers which are still closing the way towards an international legal order. Two important aspects should be emphasized. In the first place the modern regional assemblies open up to the nations concerned the possibility of devoting continuous care to their regional interests by periodic common discussion, which may ease difficulties and prevent formal disputes arising. And in the second place, these regional assemblies present the great advantage of creating a possibility of making governments directly accountable —

perhaps responsible is at the present stage too strong a word — to representatives of their nations, no longer as in the past exclusively on the national level, but also on the international one.

In the present organization of the world-as-a-whole we see tens of spheres of action and responsibility constituted by the single states within their own framework, between which spheres no contacts, nor communications, are in existence. So that for purely national reasons or sentiments some state can bar international action and better organization. Within the modern regional organizations, one single sphere of action and accountability exists for the whole region. Within that sphere in the long run truly regional governing bodies may become responsible to regional parliaments. In our day we witness only the first beginnings of that process; this consists mainly in a committee of national ministers explaining their action to an assembly of combined national groups of parliamentarians, an assembly representing the nations concerned indirectly only (Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe, Assembly of the WEU, Benelux Council); or national ministers co-operating directly within the precincts of one assembly, with members of parliaments (Northern Council), a more hopeful pattern. In all these modern assemblies ministers explain their action and engage in discussion, but the assembly has no power to enforce a policy upon ministers for the natural reason that in the last resort these ministers depend not upon the confidence of the regional parliament but each one upon that of his parliament at home. Only one instance is nowadays to be found of a really *supra-national* executive, the well-known High Authority of the Coal and Steel Community, an executive responsible in the true sense of this term to a regional assembly, the Common Assembly of the Community. And this assembly most remarkably may in the long run even be chosen directly by the regional electors irrespective of nationality.

We must note here a curious paradox, e.g. in the Council of Europe to take only one instance, national ministers, at home responsible to their parliaments, with which lies the constitutional supremacy, are, when combined in the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, the masters in several respects of the advisory Assembly of the Council.

Nevertheless one should not underestimate the value of this initial accountability, provided that national parliaments sustain and by sympathetic criticism and unflinching watchfulness accompany the action of regional assemblies, advisory to the government and parliament

of the region. Otherwise the regional assembly will be reduced to a weak bloodless life of speeches instead of action.

IV

International interests, I may summarize, have grown too important and too serious to leave them entirely to the care of national governments, only *a posteriori* controlled by national parliaments. As I tried to show, we cannot now expect more than experiments in international regional organization, in which, for the time being, a preponderant influence must be left to the governments concerned. But the modern assemblies can act as the precursors of an effective international parliamentary body for a "community" of nations. Our Western democratic convictions demand that the nations should not remain in their present position of onlookers on the international actions of governments, but should play their own responsible rôle in the international sphere itself; and that their representatives should voice their opinions and views in a common assembly. Experience gained in regional bodies may in due course be helpful towards strengthening the U.N.O.

Using modern terms, we are sorely in need of supra-national bodies able to organize cooperation as well as pressure, in order that the peoples of the world may become real actors on the international scene, bearing their full responsibility for their fate, as far as this is humanly possible.

Responsibility: the whole question again gravitates around this essentially biblical and therefore western concept. When speaking of a "responsible society," we ought not to direct our attention only in the last place to the constitutional and legal implications and consequences of that concept. In international matters we now witness a weak responsibility, a torso only of responsibility, as I tried to indicate above. The regional assemblies, founded upon a common ground of ethical and spiritual presuppositions, of historical ties and experiences in past and present times, may well be called to clear the field for a future institutional framework in which international executives may be rendered fully responsible — in the true sense of the word — to international assemblies, one of the elements of an international legal order. A great task lies ahead, a task for long years to come, to be fulfilled with wisdom and courage, deserving the care and attention of the Church, the supra-national body par excellence.

ECUMENICAL CHRONICLE

REPORT

**of Bishop Otto Dibelius, Chairman of the Council
of the Evangelical Church in Germany**

*at the third ordinary meeting of the Second Synod of the
Evangelical Church in Germany in Berlin
26-30 April 1958*

The report of the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany is in your hands. As I rise to speak now to bring the report to life before you, I should like with your permission to depart from my usual method of approach, owing to the special circumstances with which our church is faced. I should like to leave aside all points of detail, including the special relationships of our church, the work of the "Aussenamt" and that of the Gustav-Adolf Organisation in friendly association with it, the work of Inner Mission and Hilfswerk, the ecumenical activities and the mission work which is becoming more and more closely identified with it. I should like to go straight to the two main questions which are to be discussed at this Synod.

The first question concerns true Christian education.

This question involves the Christian Church all over the world, and in every age. It begins in the New Testament and has continued to the present day. Even where the state has completely or almost completely taken over the domain of education, the question does not cease to be one of deep concern to the Church; in the first place because the Church still has a number of direct educational tasks to fulfil: in its kindergartens, its courses of religious instruction, its training establishments and so on—and there must be constant re-consideration of these tasks and an attempt to reach understanding about them. In the second place, because the school is not by any means the only instrument of education, and perhaps not even the most important one. There are the parents. Even to-day it is still generally acknowledged that it is the duty of parents to bring up their children. That is stated in the Constitution both of the German Federal Republic and of the German Democratic Republic. The strongest influences of all are the manifold effects exerted on the rising generation by the communal life of a nation. In all this the Church, by virtue of the Gospel, has its word to say. If it did not do so, it would no longer be the Church of Jesus Christ.

It is not for me to anticipate what will be said to us during the Synod, in the speeches and discussions. Nor can it be required of me that I should deal in detail with educational affairs in the German Federal Republic or the German Democratic Republic — however much our wishes as parents or as office-bearers of the church may lie in that direction. All I can do here is put my finger on one point which has come before the Council of the Evangelical Church again and again in the last year, and with growing urgency. I mean the life of the Christian congregations in the German Democratic Republic — a question which is beyond any doubt of vital significance for the Christian education of the rising generation.

As you all know, during this last year a change has taken place in the life of the German Democratic Republic that is making itself felt in every domain. The radical wing of the SED, i.e. the Communist Party, has taken command. Members of the central leadership who did not toe the party line have been jettisoned. Dr. Otto Nuschke, who still occasionally stood up for his evangelical Church at Cabinet meetings, has died. The campaign of "purification" has become more and more extensive. The purge in the universities has probably caused the biggest sensation among the public. A great many professors and lecturers have fled to the West. The schools received the same treatment. Passport regulations have been tightened up. It is much more difficult to-day than it was a year ago for citizens of the German Democratic Republic to travel to West Germany or to non-Communist foreign countries. The reverse is also the case. We feel that every day in our efforts to maintain personal contacts between the western and eastern sectors of our Church.

The resolutions passed on 4 March 1958 by the Politburo of the Communist Party Central Committee, and their interpretation by leading members of the Politburo are typical of this new trend. The resolutions begin with the statement that essentially the foundations of the Communist overall structure in the German Democratic Republic may be regarded as already laid. The all-important thing now is to arouse and strengthen the Communist consciousness not only of Party members, but also of the rest of the population.

The Communist education of the masses (please note, not only of Party members, but of the masses !) must now be tackled with the utmost energy. From now on it must be placed at the centre of all the work of the Party. It is not enough that in the last few years tens of thousands of qualified officials have been trained in the Party schools. New organizations must be created, new literature must be distributed among the people. And teaching men and women to be atheists must have the central place in all this. All belief in a supernatural reality must be overcome, for it prevents people from devoting all their strength to building the Communist society. The

writings of Ernst Haeckel, of Josef Dietzgen, who round about the year 1890 was the religious philosopher of radical German Socialism, the writings of the French apostles of enlightenment and other atheists of the past, who could be regarded as already defeated 50 years ago in Germany, are to be produced in popular editions. First on the list of subjects which are to be dealt with in lectures is the theme: "The atheistic character of dialectical materialism." And this atheist propaganda is to be aimed above all at adolescent youth.

These are the watchwords of the large-scale new campaign against Christianity and the Christian Church that has been in progress in these last few months.

Now this in itself need not surprise us. The statement that there can be no compromise between religion and Communism has been repeated hundreds of times, and certainly much more frequently by Communists than by Christians. A recent issue of "Neues Deutschland," the official organ of the Communist Party, contained the dictum that there can be no peaceful co-existence between religious and socialistic ideologies! And Mr. Erich Honecker, who has just been called to the central leadership of the Party, declared at the 35th plenary session of the Central Committee: "The strength of the Marxist-Leninist working class Party lies in the fact that the Party is guided by a homogeneous and complete scientific ideology, which admits no faith in God or, in supernatural powers, no superstition and no reaction."

It is true that on occasion we may hear different views. Thus, for instance, a thousand young workers of Western Germany were recently told: "In the German Democratic Republic the Church has every facility for carrying on its religious activities within the limits of the law. Complications have arisen only since the Federal Republic joined NATO and since the agreement about military chaplaincies. That is the only point at issue. If the agreement were annulled, conditions would revert to normal. In addition the Church would of course have to give up its opposition to youth dedication ceremonies. Many Church leaders have become rather nervous since the sputniks started, but there is no reason for them to be nervous. The citizens of the Democratic Republic have different views on life. This is quite normal."

That speech was aimed at the West. Every child in East Germany knows that in reality things are quite different. It cannot be otherwise. Communism is a militant affair. Wherever we listen in to the Communist world we hear of battle, of revolution, of irreconcilable differences, of signals to attack. "Between scientific Socialism and bourgeois idealism (which includes Christianity!) there are irreconcilable differences," wrote Hermann Matern recently. "Any attempt to attenuate, to deny or to gloss over this conflict must inevitably benefit the enemy and do great harm to Socialism. The Party cannot tolerate that the policy of peaceful co-existence of the various systems of government should be also applied to its ideology."

If in the ebb and flow of political tides the Communist leadership is swinging back again to radicalism, the result is bound to be that the Christian faith will be opposed with new determination by the state, and that the Church can only remain in existence as long as the state (for reasons of home and foreign policy) hesitates to strike the final blow.

We are not forgetting for a moment that quite a few members of the Communist Party, including some who hold important state posts, do not approve of this radical atheistic trend. It is possible for us to maintain personal, human contact with many of them, although as Party members they have left the Church. Nor do those of us who live in the West forget for a moment that we are living in the same fatherland as these others. It is and will continue to be our heartfelt wish that this common fatherland of ours may soon be unified again as a single state. That in itself pre-supposes that we regard all those living in the German Democratic Republic, even those who do not share our Christian faith, as our brothers and sisters — quite apart from the fact that as Christians we should be fraternally minded towards all human beings.

But in the matters with which we are concerned to-day, the power is in the hands of the radicals.

Thus a situation has arisen in the Democratic Republic which I should like to describe in the following way, while trying to remain as objective as possible:

Every possible propaganda medium is being used to induce people to leave the Church. Party officials must leave the Church. Members and prospective members are being compelled to do the same. Special meetings are being held at which the registrar accepts declarations of withdrawal from the Church right there on the spot. Officers of the People's Police Force must have ceased to be members of the Church. Ordinary members of the police are being pressed to take the same step. That is quite obvious from the declarations of withdrawal which are received by the pastors concerned after each new recruitment. If a Bible is found at a kit inspection, the policeman has to send it home at once. In residential colleges for student teachers, too, any student among whose belongings a Bible has been seen is told in a disagreeable interview that this sort of thing will not do.

To let the Synod see what the procedure is in such cases, I shall take as an example from the many reports we have before us the events of the last few weeks at the Teachers' Training Institute in Güstrow.

On January 28, 1958 a woman student, Ingrid Schreck, was called to account by the Deputy-Director, Jaguttis, at an interview which lasted several hours, because a Bible had been found among her books. She was told that this was a disgrace to the Institute. Fräulein Schreck thereupon left the Institute.

On March 6, 1958 lecturers stated at the Youth Forum that students could have a religion, but they must not be Christians if they wanted to become teachers.

On March 25 posters were put up in the student hostels and in other parts of the Institute, showing a woman student looking on one side towards a Bible and a Cross, and on the other towards Marx and the FDJ. Underneath was written: "We will not tolerate it!"

On February 19 Fräulein Wendler, a pastor's daughter, was given — by two Party members and the head of the seminar — the alternative of renouncing her Christian faith or of leaving the training college.

On March 10 the department head, Fräulein Ihlefeld, repeated this ultimatum.

On March 12 the Criminal Police Department took away her identity card, so that she could not go to the West.

On March 19 judgement was passed on Fräulein Wendler by her seminar group. The judgment contained the following statements;

"Hansi Wendler has not been able to free herself from her idealistic principles, her faith and her Church, in spite of her study of Marxist-Leninist teachings. On the contrary, her religious convictions have been strengthened... Her fellow-students are unanimously of the opinion that she cannot become a teacher in German democratic schools."

The head of the seminar took this opportunity of asking the views of the other members of the group. The outcome was that the whole group promised to withdraw from the Church.

On March 26 a poster was put up bearing the signatures of 19 members of the teaching staff. This is what it stated, among other things:

"The aims of the Training Institute are incompatible with membership of the student congregation and similar Protestant and Catholic church organisations. The Academic Council insists upon... withdrawal from these organisations... Students who do not comply with this demand and recognise the illegal educational claims of the Church... will be struck off the register."

On March 28 Fräulein Wendler was struck off the register without any reason being given in writing. The same thing happened to 10 other Christian students, Protestants and Catholics, who did not belong to the student congregation.

On March 29 the student chaplain petitioned the Public Prosecutor because of these events, but no action was taken.

On March 31 it was announced at a Party meeting of the SED in the Training Institute that two other members of the student congregation would be struck off the register.

That is one example among many, among scores!

Then there is a systematic drive — to build up the atheistic state “opposition-church.” Instead of baptism, the atheistic naming ceremony is being introduced. In State maternity hospitals this ceremony is regularly observed. In Altenburg the registrar handed over to the parents at this name-giving a savings book containing 100 DM. In Suhl, firms are being encouraged to give presents to parents on this occasion. And to make everything clear, the burgomaster declares in the press: that the ceremony has been instituted because many parents have expressed the wish to bring up their children as atheists. Then there is the solemnisation of the marriage contract, which is to take the place of the Church marriage service. Then burial rites with atheist speakers. I know a little provincial town, for instance, with some 7000 inhabitants, in which there are two pastors carrying on their ministry, but where five secular funeral orators are available and are recommended by official newspaper announcements!

The climax of this anti-Church organization is the youth dedication ceremony (“Jugendweihe”) together with the instruction that precedes it. In the speech to young West German workers already referred to, this training for the “youth dedication” is described as follows: “They visit factories, institutes, observatories, the Nuclear Physics Institute, they go on excursions, visit tractor stations, take an interest in the development of agriculture. In short, these young people are increasing their general knowledge and becoming familiar with new scientific discoveries.” Yes, if that were all, nobody would dream of taking exception to these periods of instruction. We should only ask why they were not simply incorporated in the school course, instead of being called “youth dedication” periods and ending with a youth dedication ceremony which does not exist, as a state institution, in any other Communist-ruled state in the world.

Unfortunately that is not all.

The whole of the youth dedication instruction is given in the spirit of the materialist ideology. It is not as a rule publicly stated that it is education for atheism, but just occasionally that comes out — for instance when Paul Fröhlich writes about the information given in the youth courses that these courses give young people a chance to realise for themselves that the religious legend of the creation of the world was refuted long ago, and that the world took shape out of matter; there was no need of God, or of several gods! Or else the old battle-song is quoted at the youth dedication: “No higher being saves us, no God, no emperor, no champion.” And to set the atheistic seal on all this, each boy or girl “dedicated” is given a copy of the book “Weltall-Erde-Mensch” (“Universe-Earth-Man”). This book was withdrawn for a time, because the churches protested against its purely materialistic content. Now it is again being distributed at all “youth dedication” ceremonies.

The position is quite clear. The youth dedication ceremony tries to substitute for Confirmation (that is to say the boy's or girl's confession of faith in God and Jesus Christ) the confession of an atheistic faith in the things of this life. So it has been from the beginning, and so it is to-day.

Even so, the Church would not say much about it. It is not saying much about it in Western Germany, where there are after all plenty of these youth dedication ceremonies. What we are protesting against is simply the fact that it is being enforced by the state, and that pressure of a kind never hitherto experienced is being brought to bear on the conscience of young people and their parents. Something of this pressure did exist before, but the state did not identify itself with it. A few years ago President Grotewohl was still able to declare to representatives of the Church that the "youth dedication" ceremony was a matter with which the state had nothing to do; anyone who attended the ceremony did so of his own free will; anyone who preferred to be confirmed was free to do so!

Now there has been a fundamental change in the situation. The signal for it was given in the speech made by Deputy-Premier Walter Ulbricht at the "Inauguration of Youth Dedication Year 1957/58" as it was officially called, at Sonneberg, Thuringia. Now the attitude was suddenly: The youth dedication ceremony is not only a matter for independent committees, but for the workers in factories, the trade union leaders, the party organisations and also for the national education sections of the local and district councils, that is to say the state school administration. The whole machinery was then at once set in motion. Teachers who refused to help with canvassing for "youth dedication" ceremonies were dismissed without notice. Young people who attended confirmation instead of the dedication ceremony were refused admission to the secondary schools, however good their certificates might be. And in offices and factories pressure began to be put on the parents. Everywhere they were menaced: if your child does not attend the youth dedication ceremony, you will lose your job, and your child will not be eligible for higher education. And these are no longer by any means empty threats, as they used to be. Latterly even University professors have not been spared, although they are assured in their special contracts that their children (as it is so curiously put) are to be placed on the same footing as the children of industrial and agricultural workers and have access to all the educational facilities of the German Democratic Republic. Now even these children, however good their school record, are debarred from higher education because their parents are loyal to the Church.

To give another concrete example, I was recently in conversation with one of the waiters in a West German hotel. He told me that until a few weeks before he had been working in Thuringia. His wife was employed in the municipal administration there. One daughter had put her name down

for confirmation. He was called before the mayor, who asked him why his daughter was not on the list for the "youth dedication" ceremony. He replied: "We are a Christian family; our daughter is being confirmed." Whereupon the mayor said: "You forget that your wife is a civil servant." Answer: "We are not prepared to give up our Christian faith for the sake of a civil service post." The next day his wife was dismissed without notice and he himself lost his job, after which the whole family moved to West Germany.

Such things are happening every day. In West Germany one can hardly imagine how strong the pressure is and what struggles are going on in families. First the teacher comes to the house to work upon the family, after he has already declared in class, time and again: "Anyone who does not take part in the youth dedication ceremony will not be admitted to the secondary school." Then the headmaster deals individually with every boy or girl who does not appear to him to be reliable. In the factory the Party official is working on the father. The same is happening to the mother. If she does not work outside the home, someone delegated by the women's organisation comes to the house. The house or street leader does the same. Then there is the constant drumming in on the radio and in the press. And finally it all culminates in the question put to the boy or girl: Do you want not only to ruin your own future but to make your father and mother lose their jobs?

It is really a miracle that there are still any families who stand out against this concentrated pressure.

Many teachers in canvassing for the dedication ceremony, which they are obliged to do, are in the habit of passing over in silence the atheistic nature of the whole business, so as to win over the parents and make up their quota. The wording of the youth dedication vow is a help here, as there is no mention in it of atheism; it concentrates on "work for a happy life for the German people," on "the great and noble cause of Socialism" and on "friendship with the Soviet people and with all peace-loving men and women." Many parents who have no intention at all of being disloyal to their church, but who do not want to risk their children's future and their own livelihood, let themselves be taken in by it.

The church sees all this happening. It has no coercive means at its disposal, nor does it want them. It is a complete misrepresentation of the truth to say, as is so often said: The state has instituted the youth dedication ceremony, and the church forbids young people to take part in it. A Protestant church is not called upon to forbid anything, and it does not forbid anything. We can only say, in that limited sphere where we are permitted to speak, that youth dedication and confirmation are incompatible — just what the other side has said hundreds and thousands of times. We can only point out that the Church, in the name of Jesus Christ, expects those who

were baptised as children to profess their faith in their Lord after they have received instruction in that faith. It is our duty to say that. The decision we leave to the conscience of parents and children. The fact that that decision is bound to have fundamental consequences as regards their participation in Holy Communion and other manifestations of congregational life is a matter that must be left to the judgment of the Church. To mention these consequences in the same breath as the threats made by the other side is simply absurd.

The real damage that arises from the present situation goes much deeper, however. The materialistic school of thought is the only one that is known to the educational system of the German Democratic Republic. With the passing of the years this characteristic of the state schools has gradually become more and more pronounced, and in the last few months has perceptibly assumed radical importance. Just at this time an educational conference is discussing how the education of young people can be organized more consistently in accordance with the principles of dialectical materialism. Meanwhile, as I have already said, the attack on teachers for whom truthfulness is a matter of conscience is in full swing.

I repeat, it is not for me to pass judgment on the organisation, the teaching methods and the work of the schools in the West and in the East, however vitally concerned the Church may be in all these matters.

I have only this one thing to say here: for every Christian church there is one claim that can never be given up, the claim to freedom for the life of faith and for convictions of conscience, and the claim that this freedom should not be destroyed by the pressure of outward advantages and disadvantages — least of all among young people. For such a system is a schooling in hypocrisy.

I read recently in a newspaper that schoolchildren in the German Democratic Republic are to-day so accustomed through their school life to double-entry bookkeeping — in other words to saying and writing what is wanted, and inwardly thinking quite differently — and have cultivated this double-entry bookkeeping so systematically, that it no longer occasions them any inward difficulty to be confirmed one Sunday and to go to the youth dedication ceremony the next. In fact things have now come to such a pass in many congregations that the honest, decent children make a real decision — often with sore hearts — while other candidates for confirmation never mention to their pastor that for the sake of their parents they are going to the youth dedication ceremony immediately after being confirmed.

This state of affairs is poisoning the souls of our young people. And here lies the duty of the Church. We do not want the cleavage between home and school to go on deepening. We do not want children from Christian homes to come home from school and relate something the teacher has said

to them, and their parents to tell them: "You must not believe that; we think otherwise; but you must not say so in school; there you must write and do everything as they want you to; otherwise you will not be able to go on to the senior school." We do not want our children to grow up in an atmosphere in which honesty and truthfulness no longer have any place.

We do not want this, and we have no right to want it. That is why we insist that freedom of conscience should be respected in the life of our people, and above all in the life of our young folk.

In my young days religion was a subject just like any other subject in the German schools, and counted just as much for transfer to a higher class as other subjects. Then people said: Religion is a matter of conviction; no pressure must be brought to bear on a person's convictions; whether a child has good or bad marks or fails in religion should have no influence of his transfer to another class. The Church did not oppose this. It must resist, however, if the new attitude is to be: religion is a private affair; atheism is a state affair; And that is what it is coming to, with this pressure to attend the youth dedication and this discrimination against Christians in the teaching profession and elsewhere. Martin Luther said: "Where temporal powers make bold to lay down laws for the soul, they are meddling in God's domain, and corrupt and destroy the soul."

It is plainly stated in the Constitution of the German Democratic Republic: "Every citizen shall enjoy full freedom of belief and conscience." The coercion exercised with regard to the youth dedication is unquestionably contrary to this basic article of the Constitution.

I shall refrain from going more fully into all the other things that are no less contrary to the Constitution and that are intolerable to Christians: the sabotaging of pastoral care in hospitals and other public institutions, the dismissal of workers and employees merely because they are loyal to the Church, and all the rest. I am concerned now only with this one question: are we to stand by and passively watch the state forcing people into the profession of atheism in the German Democratic Republic? Or are we not?

Over a month ago the conference of church leaders in the German Democratic Republic drew up a memorandum addressed to the highest administrative levels of the Republic — a dispassionate, objective memorandum in which every word had been most carefully weighed and every example quoted had been checked and double-checked. This memorandum was returned immediately. It is now lying in some government office. No answer has been received.

The memorandum closes with the question: "Can we, who by reason of our faith must reject the atheistic ideology for ourselves, continue to live as citizens of the German Democratic Republic without having fundamental

civic rights denied to us or curtailed?" As this question has so far gone unanswered, I am repeating it here quite openly: Is the Christian, the conscientious, practising, Protestant Christian a second-class citizen in the German Democratic Republic? Or does that clause of the Constitution — a Constitution which the German Democratic Republic gave to itself — still hold good: "Every citizen shall enjoy full freedom of belief and conscience?"

I ask this question on behalf of more than 10 million Protestants in the German Democratic Republic. And I await an answer.

The question is not directed only towards the German Democratic Republic, however. It is directed also to ourselves and to our church in the West as well as in the East.

We shall have to make a completely new beginning in the matter of education. We shall have to integrate the Christian education of our children into church life in quite a different way henceforward. We shall have to make a complete new study of the question of confirmation. We shall have to realise in a new way the priesthood of all believers. We want to come to a joint understanding about this and many other questions, in East and West Germany. For we are *one* Church and want with God's help to remain *one* Church.

But let no one imagine that a Church oppressed as the Church in East Germany is oppressed ceases to be joyful and confident. There can no longer be any doubt about it, our life as a Church is being forced to take a new form. But out of this new form, within which the faithful, their numbers smaller than before, stand more strongly in their Christian faith, the life of the Church will derive undreamed-of strength, judging by experiences in other countries.

We do not put our trust in human experiences, however, but in the promise our risen Lord made to His own. In gratitude and in confidence we accept His word that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church.

I now come to the second point which is to be discussed by the Synod.

It goes without saying that the question of military formations in East and West Germany, and in particularly the dispute as to whether the West German Army should be equipped with atomic armaments, have been given the full attention of the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany.

At our last Synod we decided to conclude an agreement with the German Federal Republic about military chaplaincies. This made the political authorities in the East very angry indeed. We are now, according to East German propaganda, a NATO Church with a NATO Synod, with NATO bishops, NATO relief schemes, in short, a Church that has sold itself completely and unequivocally to the West. We have been told again and again recently that a new relationship between state and church in the German Democratic Republic can be established only when the agreement on military chaplaincies is denounced by the church.

For me and many others, it has not been very easy to see why our decision has produced such a result. Pastoral care concerns all that is deepest in human life. Faith and conscience are involved. The Church carries on its ministry, committed only to its Lord Jesus Christ. It carries it on not only in war, but first and foremost in time of peace. It allows no power on earth, not even politics, to influence it in that ministry. It looks upon it as its simple duty to prevent the soldiers who belong to it from losing contact completely with the Christian gospel in their youth. We have not signed an agreement with NATO, but with the German Federal Government. We wanted to conclude the same kind of agreement not only with that one government, but with both the political territories in which we have our home. The members of the Synod, even those from the West, were ready to consent to an agreement on the matter with the East as well as with the West, notwithstanding the fact that some political circles in the West might oppose it and might say the Church had no right to conclude an agreement with an East German Government not recognised by the West. The East then rejected the Church's proposal in the bluntest conceivable terms, and this left only the agreement with the West. It is really difficult to understand how anyone can assert, on the basis of these facts, that the Church, in signing the chaplaincies agreement, had gone over to the side of NATO.

Moreover, it is clear that in Eastern Germany they have very strange conceptions of a chaplains' work. At Easter, a big meeting of young West German workers in Erfurt was told that military chaplains were in duty bound to bless the war operations of the future and even to bless those who drop atom bombs! The workers were also told that the Western military chaplains had to carry on their ministry in accordance with the instructions of Defence Minister Strauss! If people would only take the trouble to examine the text of our agreement and take note of what I am going to say in a moment on the question of war, then perhaps they would realise what silly talk all that is. I would go further and add the sentence contained in the report of the Army Bishop for the past year: "It has always been considered beyond question that this service was to be understood and carried out as a spiritual office, in complete independence of military and political authorities." It is in that light, and not in any other, that we all regard military chaplaincies.

Here I must put in a word about the legal opinion which Dr. Ulrich Krüger made public a few days ago and which culminates in the assertion that the East German member churches had broken the law of the German Democratic Republic by consenting to the agreement on military chaplaincies.

This entire opinion is invalidated by the fact that the agreement was concluded by virtue of Article 10b of our statutes. It is true that many synod members from East Germany approved the agreement at our Synod, only

they did so not as representatives of their member churches but as independent members of the Synod, who are not bound by instructions, not even instructions from their member church. The agreement, however, is binding only on the "member churches concerned," and each of these had to approve through its own synods. The member churches in the German Democratic Republic were naturally excluded here, as not among those "concerned." They were never asked for their consent and never gave any consent in the matter. The entire agreement does not affect them at all.

I want to place that formally on record.

Now, as a result of the latest development, public discussion has started on the particular question of whether the West German armed forces should be equipped with atomic weapons. The petition of the western Brotherhoods, with its 10 points, received wide publicity. Then at the end of March came the Bundestag debate, in which the whole of Germany, East and West, took vehement part. Then came all the different demonstrations, with the slogan "Down with atomic destruction!".

The Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany refrained from issuing a statement on this question, in view of the forthcoming Synod. The Council in the meantime simply sent a delegation to inform Chancellor Adenauer of the deep concern felt by Protestant Christians regarding this whole development. It was not, as has been sometimes stated in the press, by deliberate arrangement that the deputation called on the Federal Chancellor actually during the Bundestag debate; in fact it had nothing whatever to do with the whole debate. This was what happened: In the late summer of last year the World Council of Churches had passed a resolution in New Haven on the question of atomic weapons. This resolution amounted to a proposal that the great powers should suspend production of atomic weapons for a limited period, in the hope that the other side would follow suit. It was suggested that the resolution should be submitted to the governments of the countries to which the churches belonged. In Germany we conscientiously did this. We communicated the resolution both to the western Federal Government and to the East German Council of Ministers. We added that we should hold ourselves in readiness for personal talks on the matter. Prime Minister Grotewohl answered by letter and suggested that we might make this New Haven resolution the subject of a pulpit announcement. This was a course we were unable to take, but we said we were prepared to send the resolution to all pastors in the German Democratic Republic, if we were given the authorisation to print it. The authorisation was granted and the New Haven resolution was sent to all pastors, with the recommendation that its contents should be brought to the knowledge of the congregations in church and at congregational meetings, as appropriate.

Chancellor Adenauer informed us that he had read the resolution, and that in compliance with our wish he would talk with us personally about it as soon as he could find the time. A series of obstacles came in the way: the Chancellor fell ill and went away to convalesce. While he was away, however, he sent us word that he would be available for talks with us on March 25. At that time there was still no question of a foreign policy debate around that date. Then the debate was arranged. It went on for longer than anyone had expected, but the Chancellor nevertheless kept to the appointed date, and so the talks took place on March 25.

But although the Council had to refrain from issuing a statement immediately on the subject which had so roused public opinion, it could not pass over the question at its own meetings. When it had become clear, after Christmas, that there was a desire to discuss atomic weapons at the present Synod too, it looked at first as if the whole Synod might be called in question. There were some who stated plainly: If that is so, then we shall not come to the Synod at all!

There was no wish to experience for the third time a Synod at which the real church matters which concern us are crowded into the background by political questions. There was no wish for more controversial votes, which after all show only that Christians can have different opinions in political matters.

The question whether we should hold the Synod now or not, remained undecided up to the last minute in the highest bodies of our Church, until the Council came almost unanimously to the decision that the Synod should certainly take place now. It must show that a Protestant Synod is quite a different matter from the political and socio-political assemblies that have spoken up to now. It must and will deal with both subjects from a spiritual standpoint.

The tremendous propaganda, quite unheard-of in the whole history of our Church, which is inundating us in the form of letters and newspaper articles, always with the same demands (we should not discuss education; we had only to agree with the 10 points of the Brotherhoods and make the agreement on military chaplaincies invalid), all this propaganda did not succeed in misleading us.

It will be for the Synod to decide whether this attitude of the Council was right or not.

In the meantime, a first public answer has been made, within the Church, to the petition of the western Brotherhoods, at the Württemberg Synod. There the Bishop of Württemberg registered his personal protest against two of the points in it, first against the wording of Point 8, which demands in

the name of the Gospel that "the preparations for an atomic war" in our country and state should be stopped immediately, regardless of any other considerations. Preparing to meet the eventuality of war and to prevent it, said the bishop, is not at all synonymous with preparing for war. He then protested against the content of Points 9 and 10, which state categorically and dictatorially that any standpoint other than that of the Church Brotherhoods, or neutrality in atomic matters, is indefensible for a Christian; both, meant the denial of all three articles of the Christian faith. This, went on the bishop, was a case of political and theological short-circuiting which might cause serious confusion in Church and state.

Similar views have been expressed at more than one meeting of responsible church bodies not held in public.

And now let me address a personal appeal to the Synod — not in order to anticipate the discussion, but because as Chairman of the Council I feel myself in duty bound to ensure that we hold to what we have laid down in our statutes. According to Article 1, the Evangelical Church in Germany is the visible manifestation of the established communion of German Protestant Christians, in that she acknowledges the Gospel of Jesus Christ as her foundation. It is true that the member churches are exhorted to listen to the testimony of the brethren. The task of the Synod, however, should be to promote the continued life and inward growth of the Evangelical Church in Germany.

I want to recall emphatically to your minds these clauses, relating as they do to the unity and communion of the Evangelical Church in Germany.

There should be no talk of Protestant Christians having to sever their fellowship with one another and form another Confessional Church because of a question which comes upon us from without.

Of course every pastor has the right to join together with like-minded persons, whatever their watchword — as indeed is the case in the "Brotherhoods." But there should be no talk of a new "Confessional Church." The history of the Church in the last hundred years should have opened our eyes to the fact that the blessing of God does not lie upon schisms that are not called for with compelling clarity on the basis of Holy Scripture. And if no other reasons can prevail here, then responsibility for the brethren in East Germany ought to nip any such thought in the bud. I need not dwell on what it would mean for the brethren in the East in their present position if anything in the nature of an opposition church were formed in the West.

We will listen to the testimony of the brethren, as we are told to do in our statutes. And our friends in the Brotherhoods may be certain that we can enter into the sore distress of conscience that they are feeling, for there

is not one of us who has not also been tormented for months by this same question. I still have not given up hope that international agreements, towards which everything is tending, will bring about a radical change in the military situation. But if that does not come about, and if we really were to be faced one day with the unpalatable fact that German soldiers have to use atomic weapons, then, if I am still in office, I shall call together the spiritual leaders of our member churches to discuss with the military bishop and myself along what lines our ministry among the armed forces should be carried on in those circumstances.

And if it should turn out that a change must be made in the legal form of military chaplaincies, I should be the last to raise objections of principle. I am only concerned that our young brethren in the army should have someone to whom they can unburden themselves, who will give them advice based on the Gospel, who will help them just when they are called upon to make the last and most difficult decision of all.

Will you allow me one more purely personal reflection: I am always very reluctant to characterise a particular human action as sinful, for I am much too strongly convinced that all our actions and thoughts are hopelessly enmeshed in sin. All the more so if it actually comes to total war — I do not know how any Christian can be expected to keep himself free of the meshes.

The important thing here is simply that a man's conscience should remain alive, even under the tremendous pressure of military discipline, which cannot be dispensed with, and that where the Christian conscience comes up against certain bounds beyond which it cannot go, then these bounds must be respected. I am not afraid to say that if I were 50 years younger and were detailed to use one of these modern means of mass destruction, I should go to my military chaplain — that is what he would be there for! — and say to him: Help me to get out of this duty. I cannot do it!

But as we meet now as a Synod, we want to be quite clear that it cannot be incumbent upon us to add one more resolution to the 1500 that have been drafted in the last few months at political gatherings and humanitarian demonstrations of all kinds. Professor von Weizsäcker said some time ago: On such questions the Church must put into words what she alone is able to say!

That hits the nail on the head, I believe. As the Synod of the Evangelical Church in Germany, it is not our task to say something which has been said again and again in non-church circles. Instead, we have something to say that only the Church can say, that is born of the spirit and essence of the Gospel, something that the Church must say, whether the world will listen or not — because, as it is written, the love of Christ constraineth us!

It is true that even among sincere Christians there may be differences of opinion as to how the Gospel of Jesus Christ is to be applied to the concrete circumstances of our time. That is brought painfully home to all of us when questions are involved that prey on all our minds. But when a synod speaks out in obedience to the word of God, we must give the foremost place to that which unites us all in the name of our common Lord. It is a united witness that we owe to the world. And it must be a witness to the Gospel, the eternal Gospel which we have to proclaim, not the law, not the attitude to be adopted towards a problem which is put to us one day thus and so, and quite differently the next. It must be a witness that retains its force and its validity even when the questionings of the moment have long become a thing of the past.

That is the kind of witness the Synod is now called upon to offer. What must be its content?

Certainly we are all at one on the fundamental issue — and indeed at one with Christians all over the world.

We said in 1956 that the Gospel does not authorise us to make wrongful use of science in order to produce means of mass destruction, which no purpose can possibly sanctify.

In 1957, we asked the World Council of Churches to continue and intensify its efforts to obtain a general ban on mass means of destruction.

The World Council of Churches, meeting in New Haven, then adopted the resolution already mentioned, in which it is stated that "methods of modern warfare as the use of atomic and bacteriological weapons and obliteration bombing involve force and destruction of life on so terrible a scale as to imperil the very basis on which law and civilization can exist." The condemnation of such methods finds broad support in the fact that total war, in the sense of warfare without any limitation in the methods employed, is universally in conflict with the conscience of mankind. We also believe that the use of such methods of warfare inevitably involves spiritual degradation for any nation that uses them."

I would not have any objection to make if we were to say that once again in some form, so as to show the world, which forgets so quickly, that for the sake of the Gospel the Evangelical Church in Germany speaks with only one voice: Weapons of mass destruction must disappear from the life of the nations! It is not only in Germany that they must have no place. A synod that is obedient to the Gospel cannot possibly think only of its own people and leave the other nations to their own devices. No, atomic weapons must disappear from the whole world!

But we must not stand idly by. The Church of Jesus Christ has learned that where there is evil fruit, the tree is corrupt, and that the preaching of the Gospel must strike at the roots of the corrupt tree.

Our fathers accepted war as an event which was taken for granted in the life of the nations. They only made a distinction between a just and an unjust war. I need hardly even say that a just war is no longer possible in this age of atomic weapons. No Christian church will condemn a defensive war. But everyone knows how problematical such an attack has become in this era of propaganda possibilities.

There is no such thing as a just war. War with atomic weapons means the murder of whole peoples. It is not really, as has been said, the organised suicide of nations. For it is not the nations that decide whether they want a war and, consequently, national suicide. The decision lies always with a handful of men and must be made in a matter of minutes. So we can only say: War with atomic weapons is mass murder of foreign peoples and of one's own people.

It is an empty hope that nations which possess atomic weapons will not use these weapons if war comes. States did not hesitate during the last war to send out their bomber squadrons to destroy cities which were of no military importance, simply in order to terrorise the population, women and children, the sick and the healthy. In a future war they would certainly make use of atomic weapons if they have them. And even if there were no more stocks of atomic weapons anywhere, ways and means would be found in a war, in which the bonds of law all cease to exist, of placing the previously discovered and mastered atomic power at the service of destruction.

Because we repudiate atomic weapons, we must repudiate war! What seemed only a few decades ago to be absurd Utopianism has now become a claim that cannot be denied. And it is for the Church to shout that claim to the world, so loudly that it cannot but be heard: There must be no more war! The discovery of atomic power has opened a new chapter in the history of mankind. War has turned into senseless destruction. But the Son of Man came to save men's souls, and it is not His will that there should be senseless destruction. In His name therefore: There must be no more war!

And what causes war?

What causes war is the idea that the state is a power in whose nature it is to eye other states in a hostile manner and to appropriate from them to itself, when a favourable opportunity offers, anything desirable that they may own: land, natural resources, industrial potential, manpower and so on — that is to say a power which knows no law but its own interest and acknowledges bonds only as long as it can hope to derive some profit from them. This idea must be overcome. There have been periods in the history of mankind when individuals, family groups, classes of society or cities that had grown powerful thought and acted as states have later come to do. That was overcome. The need of the individual for security and the moral sense of

responsibility for the human being joined forces in order to put a check — not completely, but at least in principle — on this way of thinking in the civilised world. It must be possible to achieve this with regard to states as well. It must be possible to prevail upon the states to see themselves as the legally ordained forms of life of the nations, with the task of fostering economic and spiritual life, defending justice and giving free play to religious life — without seeking to extend their power beyond those frontiers which are imposed on a people by its numbers, its history and its character.

That is not by any means a Utopian aim. Nor is it a vision forbidden to Christians by virtue of Holy Writ, or a romantic notion that fails to take into account the sinful self-seeking of human beings. Instead, it is an aim towards which God has been leading men all through the developments of the last few decades. The age of the colonialist states, during which European nations wielded power over peoples of other races, is at an end. In Europe and in other parts of the world there is an unmistakable tendency for neighbouring states to join together in supra-national unions. The number of neutral states which hold aloof in practice, or in accordance with international law, from international disputes, is growing. The idea of a league of nations, however often it may have proved illusory, is always revived. The conception that there are human rights which no state can override is alive in many hearts. Everything indicates that the age of national ambition is over. Anyone who, like myself, has grown up accustomed to the ideas associated with the national will to power has not found it easy to win through to this realisation, but the harsh realities of a changed world speak with no uncertain voice. The era of nationalism must not, and in my opinion will not, give place to an era of ideological fanaticism that incites to revolutionary conquests. Something else is on its way.

As Protestant Christians in Germany we have become wary of building up philosophies of history from events of the past and the present and then producing them as Christian findings. Yet I cannot feel it would be too bold to put forward the conjecture that this time of nuclear weapons and of world-wide apprehension and uneasiness because of them has a God-given purpose, that of showing us how we have come to the end of a centuries-old road; God has opened the door to a new way of life for the peoples of the earth, and now we must go boldly through that door. We must preach a new international ethos to the peoples of the earth, in the name of Jesus Christ.

The politician, burdened with the decisions of the day, will say: "Such prospects for the future are — as the expression goes to-day — unrealistic; what am I supposed to do with them? They do not take me any further forward." They are not meant to take him any further forward, at least not directly. The Church has no authority to dictate to a national government what it

must do at a given moment. It can only ask that government to reflect in a Christian spirit on all the various responsibilities it bears, and which a Church can never take in entirety at a glance, and then to do what it ought to do. The duty of the Church can only be to hold something up to the view of mankind, over and above the day's decisions — a vision, if you like — something which they can feel is in accordance with the spirit of the Gospel. The Holy Scriptures lay upon the church the task of teaching all nations. It is its duty not to exhaust itself with daily decisions, but to point the way forward, beyond each day — recognizing that all the circumstances in which men move are the outcome of their ways of thinking. The Church's call to the world must always be in some way a call to penitence — not a Platonic, but a practical call: Take heed, bring forth fruit worthy of repentance! At this time when an atheistic ideology is seeking to master the world with an atheistic conception of the state, the Church must proclaim an idea of the state that derives from a Christian understanding of our being as man: the state must be seen as a form of life for the nation, its purpose not to increase its power at the expense of other peoples, but to serve the inner life of its own people in obedience to the command of the holy God.

I fully realise that behind such a conception of the state there are countless problems lying in wait — the question of an arbitration authority, of a settlement between dying peoples and vigorous peoples, the question of national minorities, and a thousand other questions. But the first important step is to establish a goal, and direct the gaze of individuals and nations towards that goal. The question is not whether it serves some immediate purpose. Augustine's concept of the State did not eliminate the miseries of the migration of peoples, and Luther's preaching about just government did not make the brutalities of the Thirty Years' War impossible. Yet each of these two great concepts of the state has been exerting its influence down the centuries.

A new conception of the communal life of the nations that will abolish war — that is what the Christian Church now owes the world.

The Lord who accounts the peacemaker blessed, and whose whole Gospel is permeated with the spirit of peace, can grant to His Church to carry men and women with it along the road to a new world order. This present hour is not only a solemn one, it is an hour of great possibilities. My prayer to God is that this Synod may realise something of those possibilities, and may put its hand to the work in fellowship with the other churches of the world, so that men may say of us, in the words of Ecclesiasticus: They ventured with their whole heart, trusting in the Lord!

“May He make us bold in faith and pure in love!”

THE MOSCOW PATRIARCHATE CELEBRATES THE 40th ANNIVERSARY OF ITS RESTORATION

The month of May was a month of joyful festivities for the Russian Orthodox Church.

Dignitaries from all Orthodox Autocephalous Churches, with the exception of the churches of Jerusalem and Cyprus, gathered in Moscow and solemnly celebrated the 40th anniversary of the restoration of the Russian Patriarchate.

It was in the year 1589 that the Russian Orthodox Church was elevated to a Patriarchate by the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremiah II.

But in 1720, by a royal decree of Czar Peter the Great, the Patriarchal system was abolished, and replaced by the Synodical system.

Finally in 1927, a few days after the Revolution began, the remaining members of the Synod declared vacant the see of the Patriarch and on November 21 of the same year Tychon, then Metropolitan of Moscow, was elected the first Patriarch of the post-revolutionary Church.

Present at the celebrations, marking the 40th anniversary of the re-establishment of the Russian Patriarchate, were the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Rumania. Also the Catholicoi of Georgia (Orthodox) and of Echmiadzin (Armenian).

The celebrations began with a solemn Divine Liturgy in the Cathedral of the Epiphany (Moscow) and were concluded in the Theological Academy of Holy Trinity at Zagorsk (70 kilometres east of Moscow).

The historical significance of the restoration was eloquently expounded by Bishop Michael of Smolensk and Berlin, while its development constituted the subject of an important discourse given by Metropolitan Nikolai of Krutitsky and Colonna, the director of the Department of Foreign Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate.

Bishop Michael stressed the point of the full canonical and political independence of the present Orthodox Church in Russia, and Metropolitan Nikolai called the Orthodox Churches to act together in their relations with the World Council of Churches, and in relation to nations imperilling world peace.

The festivities ended on Thursday, the day of the Ascension of our Lord (May 22), by the signing of a "Church Deed" expressing the wish for continued cooperation by the Orthodox Churches in all fields and especially in promoting peace among the churches and peoples of the earth.

Metropolitan JAMES OF MELITA.

WORLD COUNCIL DIARY

Inter-Church Aid in the Light of Christian Obedience

The annual Consultation of the Division of Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees is much more than a formal meeting required by the constitution of the Division. It is more even than an occasion for receiving reports on the Division's work and for planning the programme for the following year, although this is one of its main purposes. The gathering is always true to its title and provides an opportunity for real conference with those who in various parts of the world are responsible for carrying out the diaconal work of the churches and who are related to the work of the Division.

Every Consultation reveals certain characteristics which make it memorable and significant for the tasks of Inter-Church Aid. The Consultations at Les Rasses in 1955 and 1956 dealt, respectively, with the so-called "widened mandate" of the Division and laid the foundations of the present agreement with the International Missionary Council for the Division's work in lands outside of Europe. The Consultation at Eastbourne in 1957 was memorable perhaps especially for the injection into the thinking of those responsible for Inter-Church Aid of the questions which are being articulated by the study of Christian Responsibility in the Areas of Rapid Social Change. The Consultation at Evian, France, from June 1-6, attended by some 120 representatives of the churches and staff, was no exception to this developing pattern. Besides the regular features of all these meetings, such as staff responsibilities and programme making, certain significant pointers to the future were clearly seen. It became apparent that the long negotiations concerning the building of the Project Lists for lands outside Europe had begun to bear fruit, not only in a much more valid presentation of needs but in a firmer basis of understanding and cooperation with the International Missionary Council and the related mission boards and societies. It was also clear that the arrangements made at Prapat for relationships between the Division and the East Asia Christian Conference were working out well and the most encouraging indications were given, as e.g., in the response to the recent appeal for the emergency in Indonesia, of a growing interest and participation of the Asian churches in the total enterprise of Inter-Church Aid.

In its earlier years when it was the Department of Reconstruction of the World Council of Churches in Process of Formation, the Division fulfilled a role in serving and seeking support for projects brought forward by various departments of the World Council. In more recent years such help has been

mainly confined to a pattern of aid to the Youth Department for Ecumenical Youth Service, to the work of CCIA in its advisory service on refugees, and to some small contribution towards the study of Rapid Social Change. At Evian new opportunities were seen by which the Division might extend this service of undergirding projects brought forward by other departments, notably by the Rapid Social Change Study, Laity, and Cooperation of Men and Women in Church and Society. But perhaps Evian will be remembered most for a development in the whole concept of Inter-Church Aid as it moves steadily from an emergency activity solely, to an expression of the new relationship which the churches have found with one another through their membership of the World Council. Some words in the Director's report to the Consultation indicate the meaning of this development. The Director said in his report: "In the fellowship of the World Council the churches have entered into a wholly new relationship with each other. A new community of churches has been born and it is the role of Inter-Church Aid to express the life of that new community. It must bring the churches together in consultation to determine what are the needs of the whole community and what is the task of the whole community in meeting those needs. Even if there were no need as we usually understand this word 'need,' there would still be a place for Inter-Church Aid as an expression of the life of the fellowship."

Theology for Evangelism

The last few years have seen a considerable growth in the evangelistic work of the churches. On every hand, there is an awareness that, whether in the West, or in Asia or Africa or Latin America, the Christian Church is in a minority position. Of the west, the term "post Christian" is in wide use as descriptive of the current scene in which the bonds of the old Christendom no longer hold. A new aggressiveness and life in the non-Christian religions make the church realize in a fresh way that it is a small minority. As a result, much time and effort has been put into evangelistic work. The attempt is nearly always made to seek a "break through," to work with either new or old methods in order to help set the stage for a significant penetration by the Gospel into secular life or into the strongholds of other faiths.

One result for this often large scale experimentation has been that certain problems which are in a particular way germane to the faith itself have been raised in bold relief. Practical work in evangelism has led directly into theological inquiry concerning some of the matters which lie underneath all experimental and method, indeed which lie at the heart of the mission of the church.

The Department on Evangelism has considered that it might render a particular service by promoting a discussion of some of these issues. For the past

two or three years, much time has been put into locating the centre of the most crucial problems, and finding a fruitful method of stating the questions. Last March the Department called a significant consultation of about forty people who are engaged in the evangelistic activity of the churches, in special experimental work, and in theological discussion concerning evangelism. The group represented Asia and Africa as well as the Continent, Britain and America. The consultation dealt with "Theology for Evangelism," and under this head discussed the following questions :

Authority and Urgency

What is our authority for evangelism? What authority do we have for intruding into other people's lives?

What "credentials" must the Church have as evidence of the fact that it actually possesses the authority which it claims to have?

What is the urgency of evangelism in relation to the work of Christ among men, in relation to death, in relation to the final end?

The Wider dimensions of Evangelism

What are the true dimensions of evangelism? In what terms should we think of evangelism's three-fold witness : kerygma, koinonia, diakonia?

The Dilemma of the Evangelist

What does the dilemma of the evangelist mean for the content and method of his work? The dilemma consists in the following : ultimately Christ alone is the evangelist, not man ; yet men feel the duty to evangelise. How does one plan to do something which ultimately he does not do? and what does this mean for the method of evangelism?

What methods of "successful" evangelism should not be used because they are incongruous with the Gospel?

Structure

What changes in the structure of church life are required by the task of evangelism today?

The consultation prepared an extended document as a first beginning of the answers to these questions. The Department plans to secure widespread study of this document and written comments and criticisms of it. A revised statement is planned for the summer of 1959, for submission to the Central Committee, and if it sees fit, for publication and wider use in the member churches.

The Brussels Universal Exhibition

The small Protestant minority in Belgium has "surprised the world" by the tenacity of its will to be represented in the Brussels Universal Exhibition, which opened in April. Beginning with no more than a convinced team of advocates, the Belgian Protestant Federation succeeded in acquiring a site in the very shadow of the central Atomium. They erected a cleanly designed chapel and display centre that holds its own in the company of some of the world's best architects and is eloquent, by reason of its modesty, in the middle of much that is ostentatious and colossal.

The World Council of Churches has been able to share in aspects of the planning and erection of the pavilion and its ecumenical exhibit. For the last three years the Council's Department of Information has advised the responsible people in Belgium and commended the project to churches in other countries. The money needed to finance the work has come in on time. It now seems certain that the pre-fabricated building can be re-erected on another site near Brussels as a permanent centre for ecumenical meetings at the service of the Belgian churches. The fine photographic display was also aided financially by the World Council's Division of Inter-Church Aid and by the United Bible Societies. Daily worship in the circular chapel and the varied programme of events within the pavilion make the small centre a living evidence of the reality of Christian unity in to-day's world.

One interesting product of the venture has been the interest shown by Belgian Roman Catholics — and particularly by priests and religious — who have flocked to the building to inform themselves more fully about the ecumenical movement and have often stayed to discuss the implications and to explain their own beliefs about the unity of the Church.

The imagination of the Belgian churches in carrying through their plan to a successful conclusion should stir the rest of the ecumenical community to take more seriously the possibilities offered by the modern passion for large-scale display. The ecumenical pavilion at Brussels '58 demonstrates the value of being present and active with a modest gesture of high contemporary standard when millions of curious people come from all over the world and are open to hear and understand the truth of the Gospel. The Belgian churches have not been afraid to reach these people. They have succeeded in communicating without being dishonest or strident. Their good work is a rebuke to the archaist and a summons to all who really care for modern man and his needs.

Impressions of Finland

At the beginning of May John Lawrence (editor of Frontier, London) and spent a fortnight in Finland as guests two members of the Bossey staff of the Church Training Institute of the Finnish Lutheran Church in Järvenpää. In our view it is one of the tasks of the Ecumenical Institute to attend meetings and conferences away from Bossey from time to time if we can thereby get in touch with people who could not otherwise be drawn into the work of our Institute, and to help them to deepen their ecumenical work.

Pastor A. Siirala and his assistant, Inga-Brita Castrén, had arranged a series of conferences and meetings in cooperation with Bishop Sormunen (the Chairman of their Board), Professor A. Nikolainen (Dean of the Theological Faculty at Helsinki), the Orthodox Bishop Paul and the Finnish Ecumenical Council. One group of Finnish Lutherans considers it particularly important to establish more intensive cooperation with the Orthodox Christians in their country. The Orthodox Church there has about 80,000 members and is therefore much smaller numerically than the Finnish Lutheran Church; but both churches are recognised by the state on a basis of parity.

First of all we attended a conference together with Lutheran and Orthodox theologians on the subject "Cross and Resurrection in Christian Worship as the centre of God's redemptive action." It was impressive to see how real contact was established between the theologians of the two different churches on the basis of this central theme. One had the impression that these churches could discover a great deal in common, the more they came to speak about the basic questions of the Christian faith. At this conference they frankly discussed the difficulties which have arisen during the history of these two churches in Finland, and which still arise today, for instance in regard to "mixed" marriages, or the way in which one church is described by the other in textbooks for schools. It became clear that these two confessions can learn a great deal from one another; for instance the Lutheran Church can take the Orthodox concept of Worship and of the Church as a basis for examining its own concepts afresh; on the other hand the Lutheran Church can encourage the Orthodox to accept more responsibility for public life than hitherto — although in this connection the Lutheran Church seems to be just entering a new phase of development. The Theological Faculty of the University of Helsinki is to be congratulated if it succeeds in founding a Chair of Orthodox Theology and using the literary treasures of the Orthodox Church in Finland. One might also hope that the Seminary for Orthodox Priests could move out of its geographical seclusion nearer to the University of Helsinki, so that it could participate in the discussions at the university and have more contact with public life.

The other meetings with journalists, youth leaders, teachers, politicians, etc. were arranged in order to introduce them to ecumenical study for the first time. We tried to show them what the churches of the world are trying to do to make Christians realise their responsibility for political, economic and social developments, and face their responsibilities in their particular professions. We described how the laity can be encouraged to realise that they are members of the Church in the world, and that as "the salt of the earth" they must purify themselves and be gathered together, so that they may then be scattered through the various spheres of life. It was moving to see how seriously these tasks are regarded by people whose church may hitherto have been too preoccupied by its own piety to venture out into secular life. Promising beginnings are, however, being made.

At these discussions another important question was brought up: whether Finland did not offer a special opportunity for contact between Finnish and Russian Christians, or (in a more general way) for men and women of both countries to meet on a new basis. At the present time delegations of all kinds are being exchanged, and perhaps this offers a good opportunity for human contacts; it is not enough to regard one another merely as representatives of an ideology, in face of which one's own position is fixed. The conversations showed clearly that, after all that has happened between Finland and Russia in the recent (and less recent) past, it is not easy for a Finn to be open-minded like this. But many of the people whom we met during our stay in Finland regarded such openmindedness as essential. They say that, at a time when (even in the churches) there is a tendency to classify people in different camps, it is of the greatest importance to try to establish fresh human contacts without prejudice, quite apart from considerations of the bloc to which they may belong. They think that perhaps people who have suffered a great deal at one another's hands may be ready in a special way to meet one another on a fresh basis. Of course it necessitates really knowing the other person and being absolutely clear about one's own position; but this does not exclude candid contact with him. If the ecumenical movement succeeds in helping Christian men and women in Finland in this task, something important might happen in this little sector which would also be of importance in a wider connection, in preparing for discussion with the Orthodox Christians of Russia.

We look back gratefully to this fortnight in Finland, recalling the extraordinary hospitality of the Finns, their friendliness towards their guests, and their eagerness to get to the very bottom of any problem. During those two weeks we saw the problems of Church and world from the point of view of Finland, sandwiched in between the great power-blocs; and this was a great help to us in our own thinking.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELEVANT WITNESS IN RUSSIA

SERMONS, SPEECHES, PASTORAL LETTERS, ARTICLES, by ALEXIUS, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia. I: 1941-1948, 247 pp.; II: 1948-1954, 179 pp.; III: 1954-1957, 247 pp. (in Russian). Published by the Moscow Patriarchate, Moscow, 1948, 1954, and 1957.

SERMONS, SPEECHES, PASTORAL LETTERS, by Metropolitan NIKOLAI. I: 1941-1946, 252 pp.; II: 1947-1950, 399 pp.; III: 1950-1954, 486 pp. (in Russian). Published by the Moscow Patriarchate, Moscow, 1947, 1950, 1954.

SERMONS, by NICOLAS, métropolitte de Kroutitsky et de Kolomna, docteur en théologie. Traduits du russe par Nicolas Poltoratsky en collaboration avec Georges Kaminka. (French translation of the sermons by Metropolitan Nikolai taken from Vol. I and II of his complete works, arranged systematically.) Editions de l'Eglise orthodoxe patriarcale russe, Paris, 1956.

Further:

SELECTED WORKS, by Patriarch ALEXIUS, translated into Czech, and SELECTED WORKS, by Metropolitan NIKOLAI, translated into Slovakian. Both published by the Orthodox Church of Czechoslovakia, Prešov, 1956.

PREDIGT DER RUSSISCH-ORTHODOXEN KIRCHE, Wesen — Gestalt — Geschichte, by K. ROSE. (Part II: Selected sermons, including (one) by Patriarch ALEXIUS, and (16) by Metropolitan NIKOLAI.) Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, Berlin, 1952, 231 pp.

Patriarch Alexius was born in 1877. He studied law and theology, entered a monastery, and was consecrated as a Bishop in 1913. He became Metropolitan of Leningrad, and in January 1945 was enthroned as Patriarch in Moscow. This collection of his *Sermons, Speeches, Letters and Essays* opens with two Easter sermons (preached in Leningrad in 1942 and 1943) and with a description of the first Easter of the war in that city. That Eastertide the pious Russian people — "itself a miracle of God" (as he remarked to representatives of the Orthodox Sister-Churches of Moscow in 1948) — experienced the miracle of the re-awakening of the Russian Orthodox Church. On Easter night the government cancelled the curfew regulations and in spite of the bombardment the population crowded into the dimly-lighted churches for the midnight services. Patriarch Alexius (at that time Metropolitan of Leningrad) describes it as follows:

"Christ is risen! Once again God has permitted us to celebrate the joyful day of Christ's resurrection! Praise be to God in Whose hands rest the years and centuries of time! He is strong to illumine the true joy of the spirit in our hearts, to increase it and to strengthen it. He himself said that 'no one can take this joy of ours from us' (John 16:22). If no one and nothing can take this joy from us, then it will shine in all the days and ages to come. Indeed this joy is so deep and all-embracing that even now, so many centuries after the resurrection of Christ, *in the hearts of Christians all over the world* it continues to burn with the eternal light with which it once burned in the hearts of the Apostles who saw the Lord after his resurrection... If it is necessary to confirm the basis of faith, to strengthen hope, to illumine love, to lend wings to prayer, to acquire grace, to overcome fear of earthly unhappiness, of evil and of death itself, to give vital meaning to our existence — for all this we find sufficient strength in these miraculous words, 'Christ is risen!' (I. 19)."

During the Easter celebrations in 1942 and 1943, Metropolitan Alexius reminded himself and the congregations also of "the Christians of all confessions" (I. 16), of "all the Christians in the world" (I. 18), of "the Christians all over the world" (I. 19) who shared the joy of Easter. Side by side with the virile patriotism which permeates the whole work of Alexius, the very first pages of his collected works express that sense of the universal fellowship of all believers in Christ which is characteristic of all his thinking. During the second world war how many church leaders in the so-called Christian states drew attention in their Easter services to the world-wide fellowship of all believers in the Christian Church? All these messages were also published immediately in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate (JMP). Although we Western Christians (particularly after the experiences of two world wars) can and will no longer accept the idea that a modern national army may be justified by quoting the wars of Constantine or even the wars of old Testament Israel, it must be emphasised that the Metropolitan of Leningrad constantly describes the Russian soldiers as "the army of defence" — a description which at that time was a true one. Even when the nation was facing its darkest hour of trial, the Patriarch maintained a clear scale of values: "First love to Christ and the Orthodox faith; then love of our beloved country" (I. 17 and many similar passages); "the Christian-patriot" (I. 48); "duty to God and to our fatherland" (I. 49). And he is indefatigable in appealing for "work in faith (*podvig*) of prayer and sacrifice — and this appeal was heard! (In Leningrad during the first two years of the war the church-members contributed over 3 million roubles to defence, besides gifts in kind. Altogether the church contributed over 200 millions during the war, of which 8 million was for the armoured division). But all that is within the framework of the confession, "our faith is the victory that overcometh the world" (I. John 5:4; I. 52).

An idea that has often been neglected in the Reformation churches is of importance for this work of faith: "In the heart of the Christian believer lives

the unshakeable conviction of the power and effectiveness of the prayers of the Church, and of God's help, especially for us Russians who are strong through interceding with God and through those 'heaven-penetrating' prayers uttered on our behalf by the countless hosts of hierarchs, monks, martyrs and militant Christians who have lived in Russia since the earliest times almost until today, and who since passing on into their heavenly fatherland have not ceased to love their fatherland on earth and to pray for it before God's throne. We can perceive on every hand — especially those of us who live near the front, for instance in Leningrad — how the prayer of the people has grown stronger and how their gifts to the Church have increased" (I: 50).

"Since the beginning of the war the prayers of the Russian Church have never ceased for a single day; they accompanied the people right up to their ultimate sacrifice" (I. 59). On the occasion of the 700th anniversary of the Russian victory over the Teutonic Orders, Metropolitan Alexius makes the moving statement: "Alexander Nevsky realised, with his genius for perception, that the temporary rule of the Tartars constituted less of a menace to Russian Orthodox life than did the papal domination of people's consciences and the Germans' craving for world-power" (I. 54f.).

The editor's foreword to the Collected Works rightly says that the sermons, letters and essays of Patriarch Alexius "which accompany the life of the Russian Orthodox Church and of Russia as a whole" express the three aspects of his faith: "unshakeable faith in the guidance of God, faith in the sanctity of God's Orthodox Church the commandments of which the Patriarch promised to keep unaltered, and warm love for the motherland."

Thus the speeches and writings in Volume I (1941-1948) deal with the following themes: The Church of Leningrad during the siege; the Russian Orthodox Church and its work during the great national war; the enthronement of Patriarch Sergius (September 1943) and his funeral (November 1944); Alexius as acting Patriarch; the "national *Sobor*" of the Russian Orthodox Church; the enthronement of Alexius (February 1945); the renewal of contacts with the Orthodox Russian Churches abroad; contacts with foreign hierarchs; consecration of bishops; services in the Monastery of the Trinity at Sagorsk, near Moscow; religious academies and seminaries; the Patriarch's journeys to the Orthodox Churches in the East; Slav culture and the Orthodox Russian people; important national days of commemoration; festival letters and greetings; miscellaneous; church administration; interviews. Volume II stresses the autonomy of the church and the growing consolidation of relations. It begins with the festival publications of the church: the consecration of bishops; contacts with churches abroad and hierarchs; the "Religious College and Theological Knowledge"; to which it adds the most important events: "the 500th jubilee of the autonomy of the Russian Orthodox Church; the Russian Orthodox Church and the defence of peace (since February 1949); the religious conference of 1952; the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Chalcedon in 1951; jubilees and church events; the death of Stalin; special events (Stalin's 70th birthday in 1949, receipt

of an Order in 1952); miscellaneous, interviews, election appeal of 1950." Volume III includes statements on the same five main topics and concludes with ten addresses given by the Patriarch on the occasion of his visit to the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in September 1957 and one address during his stay with the Serbian Orthodox Church in October of the same year. Some of the subjects show that "co-existence" between church and state in the 1920's and 1930's grew into "cooperation" under the banner of anti-fascism and world peace, with all the quick changes of situation and the bitter disappointments inherent in all merely anti-movements. But the Patriarch's letter in 1951 on the occasion of the 1500th anniversary of the Synod of Chalcedon (in my opinion one of the most valuable messages issued by the Christian Church at that time) brings out the real roots of Christian life in the world and for the world:

"...Because this *Dogma of Chalcedon* (451) expresses the real relation between the divine and the human nature in the person of the Saviour, it gives us an *unshakeable basis for divine-human life*. Its central point is Christ's Church as the visible union between God and men, as the Kingdom of God on earth. While those who believe in Christ struggle against evil and temptation, they are united in the Church with the divine element, i.e. they receive the blessed gift of the Holy Spirit which heals the weak, fills the needy and confers upon them the dignity of sons of God... (Romans 8: 19-21).

"Thus Christ's Church decides the question of man in accordance with his higher significance. It decides not only by doctrine but also in practice, by showing us the way of piety and truth, the way of Christian discipleship. This is the way taken by all the saints; the teachers of the faith, the martyrs, the saints, the monks, those who perfected certain virtues and services. By following in their footsteps, and through our faith in God, through prayer, repentance, suffering, through works of love and every other virtue, we carry divine-human relations into the life of the world, and thus strengthen the effort for goodness, justice and peace in the world.

"That is the living inheritance of the Fourth Ecumenical Synod which... is the very highest expression of our Orthodox faith in the indissoluble union of the divine and the human nature in the person of the God-man, Jesus Christ.

"In celebrating this great event we encourage one another to let ourselves be penetrated with the divine-human significance of our earthly life and with the consciousness of our Christian duty, denying ourselves in order to serve the cause of peace among men, by bringing the human element into harmony with the divine element, so that all things, things in heaven and things on earth, may be gathered together in Christ, the head." (Eph. 1: 10; II. 157 ff.)

The First Letter written by the Patriarch after his enthronement, dated February 1942, is modest and sober in describing the position of the national church within the One Universal Church of Christ:

"Christ's great promise, 'I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it' (Matt. 16: 18) refers to the One, Holy, Universal (*Ssobornaja*), Apostolic Church. But the national Church (to quote an old

church writer) 'sometimes rises to heaven, sometimes sinks to the abyss, sometimes it is guided by the power of Christ, sometimes destroyed by fear, sometimes covered with waves of suffering, sometimes moving forward on the oars of its confession' " (I. 110).

The first time the Patriarch re-visited his former metropolis, "suffering Leningrad" his "beloved city," as he calls it, was the climax of his war-experiences. "This time has taught us to seek our consolation solely in the Lord. We felt God's pity poured out upon us" (1945, I. 118).

The main concern of the head of the Russian Orthodox Church was the restoration of the life of the Church and of theology. In June 1944, while the war was still on, the first Theological Institute was opened by the Vice-Patriarch after twenty years' interruption, with the instruction that — unlike many "semi-secular religious colleges" under the Czars — it was to be strictly ecclesiastical in character, and that the students must conform to this (I. 164). In 1946 in an Easter Letter to the Church-leaders in Moscow the Patriarch gives instructions about "the interior of the church building, the lighting and the singing" (I. 237 ff.). All these considerations centre around his concern for the gathering of the faithful in prayer. Unlike cinemas and theatres, churches should be rather dark and lighted, if possible, with candles; "this will help to create silence in the heart of the worshipper, and out of this silence the inner light will shine more brightly." Anything that is not genuine must — like a lie — be excluded from a church building. It is the place where God is present and where "the soul is healed." The Patriarch insisted especially that the Nicene Creed and the Lord's Prayer should always be sung by the whole congregation, thus restoring an old custom of the Church which (in divergence from the Greek liturgies which also appoint them to be sung by the whole congregation) has not yet been restored, in practice, in the Greek churches, i.e. in Constantinople and Hellas. Anyone who attended the Russian churches after the second world war, and heard the Creed and the Lord's Prayer sung by 5,000 Slav throats, will never forget the impression. The Patriarch's addresses at the consecration of Bishops, and on the occasion of his visits to religious academies and seminaries, are also very instructive for priests:

"The Orthodox Russian people are longing for really good spiritual shepherds. Many of these do already exist, I think, but not by any means as many as the people want and who are needed for the well-being of our Orthodox Church. The Russian people therefore prays here together with those who are training for the priesthood, and regards them with particular affection as the future hope of the Church, as its future ministers who are far from the temptation which recently broke into our Church like a hurricane and unfortunately overcame a great many of our clergy. (He is referring to the conformist movements of the 1920's.) The Orthodox Russian people have very fine perceptions and great appreciation for genuine shepherds. The people are not deceived

by the precious stones which gleam on the mitre and the cross of many priests today. The people want priests who are adorned with spiritual qualities, and whose souls are radiant. It wants its shepherds to be men of high spiritual status, fathers who condescend lovingly to the needs of their flock. The Russian people go to the priest in the hope that he will give them the message of salvation, telling them how to save their souls, how to live, how to obtain God's grace, how to overcome their difficulties, how to bear their sorrows, their illnesses and their weaknesses, and how to avoid mistakes. That is what they want from their priests. They do not believe in the eloquent phrases of a preacher whose voice is not that of the Holy Spirit and of the Holy Fathers, but who is merely a clever secular orator. The speeches of such preachers do not penetrate the hearts of the Russian Orthodox people. They look to their priest to explain the Word of God and hope that the priest will show them the course they should take; then they open their hearts to him. The congregation may forgive a clergyman who is rather dry or rough, they may even forgive him for his weaknesses, but they will never forgive him for lack of faith or for being negligent, superficial or merely formal in fulfilling his pastoral duties" (II. 104 ff.).

The Patriarch also draws attention to the special vocation of women within the structure of the Church; "women now form the main body of our church-goers"; "faith finds a true home in a woman's heart. The sight of a woman without faith is hard to bear. In family life a Christian woman can do fine work. She brings God's blessing upon her whole family. She brings up her children as Christians and makes them into useful members of society and honourable citizens of their motherland." Alexius encourages women by saying that among the enemies of Christ, and among those who crucified him, there was not a single woman. (I. 160.)

The addresses given by Alexius on questions affecting the whole Church of Christ reveal an attitude that is clear and unequivocal: the relation of the Russian Church to the Orthodox sister-churches should be one of fellowship, not of hegemony; its relation to the ecumenical movement should be one of reserve; its relation to the Vatican one of rejection; its relation to its own people one of indissoluble affection. But the Russian people is not an aim in itself. Dostojewski's ideas ring through the words of the Patriarch: "Here among us the desires of the people are not restricted to their own home, their own family, or even to their own country; they reach out to all the nations of the world." (II. 150) Again, "The Church regards the whole of mankind as a family and extends its hopes to the whole world" (II. 152); here again the Patriarch's Christian universality is expressed, of which mention has already been made. And a Russian reviewer of his works rightly said of him, "The Patriarch preaches peace not only as the citizen of a peace-loving country, but primarily as an Orthodox Christian" (JMP, 1955. II. 30).

The Dean of the Religious Academy in Moscow describes the collected works of the Patriarch as follows: "The utmost clarity of language combined with extraordinary compression of exposition; a wealth of arguments com-

bined with beauty of style and a deep attachment to the Church. Numerous references to Holy Scripture, wide quotation from hymns and from the Church Fathers, an exact application of the rules of the Canons in connection with historical facts, and his erudition in theology — all these things invest the writings of the Patriarch with the necessary theological thoroughness and force of conviction" (*ibid.*).

Very characteristic also is the memorandum submitted to the Holy Synod, indicating the reason why the honorary Degree of Doctor of Theology should be conferred on the Patriarch. This memorandum stated that the messages and letters sent out by the Patriarch were models of spiritual care and of church government filled with the pure Christian spirit of charity, rooted in faith in Christ and filled with a sense of pastoral responsibility for others; "they touch the heart, arouse the will and speak to the mind in their simplicity and warmth" (JMP, 1949. II. 20). And the Hungarian Reformed Church, which conferred an honorary degree of Doctor of Theology on Patriarch Alexius in 1954, added that through the "extraordinary care he devoted to purity in preaching the message and to the training of pastors" he had given an example also to the Hungarian Reformed Church (Hungarian Church News Service, Sept. 15th 1954, vol. VI, 17 f.).

Patriarch Alexius describes his great spiritual predecessor Metropolitan Alexius of Moscow (the saint of the Tartar era in the 14th century) as follows :

"His unshakeable faith, his love for the motherland and for the Russian people, and his holy life, endeared him very much to the Russian people. What a deep love for Russia he must have had to go unhesitatingly to the Tartar court (the Golden Horde) in obedience to the order of the Khan, in order to heal his sick wife. The Metropolitan knew that if he did not succeed in curing her the Khan would inflict destruction and misery upon the land of Russia ; and that, on the other hand, if he succeeded all kinds of benefits would be showered upon his motherland. He offered a prayer at the grave of the holy Metropolitan Peter, who gave him a sign ; after which he took the difficult course and cured the wife of the Khan" (II. 167).

The whole work of the Patriarch Alexius is impregnated with the confession of Christ's resurrection with which the Christian church in Leningrad during the war ushered in a new epoch in the history of the Russian Church. It is a certainty — it is the great might of the resurrection (Eph. 1, 19 f.) :

"To our arrogant but limited minds *the resurrection of Christ* may appear to be only a symbol, not a reality. But Christians, and the Christian Church, believe not in a ghostly resurrection but in His real resurrection in His purest flesh ; this is the faith which they proclaim in many prayers and hymns. And herein lies the deepest significance of our Christian Orthodox faith. Without Christ's resurrection everything in the spiritual world would come into impenetrable darkness, under the rule of death which reduces everything to the same level and knows no distinction between good and evil, because it knows nothing about life, joy, truth, goodness and justice." But "our faith in the future life,

after this earthly pilgrimage, gives an entirely different significance and a different aspect to life here on earth. It is no longer a land of banishment in which criminals await punishment, but a scene of action, a place where we prepare ourselves for a better, more perfect life" (II. 26).

II

"In the house of God things must be different from the world outside, for in His house the members of His Church seek contact with eternal life." This instruction issued by Patriarch Alexius is recalled by the speeches and writings of Metropolitan Nikolai, the hierarch of highest rank after the Patriarch who is his representative and the head of the Foreign Department of the Russian Orthodox Church. Already before the first world war when the Metropolitan was a student at the Religious Academy in Moscow, his fellow-students called him the "Chrysostom," the "Golden tongue" of the Russian Church. His sermons are given precedence over all his other pronouncements, and they are in a different style. He does not emphasise the temporal events which occasioned the sermons. Metropolitan Nikolai's sermon on "peace" (I. 22 ff. delivered during the last year of the war) contains nothing to indicate whether it was delivered in wartime or in peacetime. It speaks of the peace of God expressed in the words "peace be to you all!" (*mir wsjem*) pronounced by the priest before the blessing at every Orthodox service all through the ages.

If the Patriarch *Alexius* may be called the *announcer of the resurrection*, Metropolitan *Nikolai* may be described as the *preacher of peace*.

In the above-mentioned sermon on peace, preached in Moscow in the winter of 1944, the description of the peace of God is introduced with wonderful similes drawn from nature: the stillness of the ocean depths even when raging storms lash its surface; the safety of the young birds in the nest deep down in the tree-trunk even when the branches are shaken with winter's hurricanes. The preacher knows how different it is when "we are surrounded on every side by sorrow, misfortune, and sickness like wild beasts ready to dig their claws into our hearts at every moment" (I. 23); he knows "the sorrows which nearly tear our hearts in pieces."

The preacher of peace — peace in the midst of sorrow and suffering — is a great artist who loves artistic contrasts. His sermon on "the wedding garment" (Matt. 22: 2 ff., II. 282 ff.) shows characteristic similarities to and differences from Chrysostom's sermon on "the ten virgins" (Rose, 105). The sermons are similar in their allegorical interpretation of the parables of Jesus and their emphasis on the anthropological and ethical aspect. But the swift, terse manner of Chrysostom of Alexandria is a complete contrast to the careful, logical, aesthetic style of the Western Russian, who as the

son of an Orthodox Russian priest Nikolai attended the grammar-school at Kowno among Lithuanians and Poles and was undoubtedly influenced by the oratory of the Catholic Church. In his sermon on the wedding garment he describes the visual beauty of nature and the oral beauty of music and then passes on to the spiritual beauty of those who follow Christ. And then the contrasts appear: the dreary carousal in the palace of King Herod — and the devotion of John the Baptist in the dungeon below; the loving repentance and humility of Mary Magdalene, and the base betrayal of mercenary Judas. (This second group in connection with a hymn on the Wednesday of Easter week.)

All Metropolitan Nikolai's sermons are sermons on definite themes. In the French edition they are divided into:

Sermons on festivals of Christ

Sunday sermons

Sermons on festivals of the Holy Virgin

Sermons on Saints' Days

Sermons on texts from Holy Scripture

Sermons on liturgical texts

Sermons on theological subjects: "The Church," "The House of God," "Faith," "The Soul," "The Law of Love"

Sermons on different subjects (including "The Wedding Garment," "The Earthly Jerusalem and the Heavenly Jerusalem").

The *theological presuppositions* for all these sermons, also for those of Patriarch Alexius, include the famous controversy about the Ancient Church versus the Reformation — i.e., the old question of *sola scriptura* and *sola fide* (in the exclusive sense) versus *synergasia*, the cooperation of man in his salvation but under the guidance of divine grace. This is not the place to go into these problems. It is clear that it is precisely that participation by Christians (not by men and women as such) in the "way of salvation" to which the Russian sermons refer. And Metropolitan Nikolai particularly includes in this "cooperation" the creature created by God, the "cosmos" (i.e. the "beautiful order" created by God — as emphasised by the Eastern Church) which is now in the power of the evil one (I. John 5: 19) as the result of human sin.

Presumably in accordance with the wish of the author, to make clear his concern for eternity in the Sermons, the French edition does not include the "Speeches and Letters" (Parts II and III of the Collected Works). The Russian edition gives the actual events referred to in every case in Parts II and III: political and ecclesiastical. The contrast between the Metropolitan's sermons and his pronouncements concerning politics and church policy is very sharp, especially during the war and immediately after. It reminds one

of the great Renaissance artist, Leonardo da Vinci, who drew hellish monsters on the back of his sketches for pictures of the Madonna. During those difficult years the Metropolitan had had much personal suffering, and had lost many of his nearest relatives and friends. Now as the Church's representative on the state "Commission for the investigation of Nazi War-Crimes in Western Russia" he (the preacher of peace) was brought face to face with all sorts of fresh horrors, which he describes in passionate letters and appeals. Again and again he speaks of "the monstrosities perpetrated by the Nazis, those brutes, cannibals, robbers, beasts, barbarians, devils, enemies of civilisation and of Christianity, dark powers of hell, hell-born monsters, whose crimes exceed all the terrors hitherto perpetrated on earth by all the barbarians and evil-doers in the world."

But his own reaction, as a participant in all this suffering, was to continue incessantly his Christian task as a "peacemaker" (Matt. 5:9), in the midst of the changing political fronts. In this he showed the tremendous adaptability of Eastern people (born of suffering and hardly possible for us to understand), while at the same time acting on bold, effective concepts which revealed more and more clearly his ultimate purpose: that all Christians should unite to heal the divisions among men.

One looks forward eagerly to the publication of the other Collected Works of Patriarch Alexius and Metropolitan Nikolai, which are already appearing in the Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate.

HILDEGARD SCHAEGER.

INTERCOMMUNION: AN ORTHODOX VIEWPOINT

INTERCOMMUNIO, by JEROME KOTSONIS. *Athens — Damascus, 1957. 333 pp. 50 Drachmas (in Greek).*

The author of this book on the problem of intercommunion is an Orthodox priest and theologian; he examines intercommunion in the light of the Canon Law of his own Church. Not being a specialist in Canon Law himself, the reviewer has tried to understand this book from the angle of his own personal interest, that of ecclesiastical history and the ecumenical movement.

In addition to the prologue (pp. 5-6), the introduction (pp. 7-10), an abstract of the whole work (pp. 275-283), the appendix (pp. 284-288), the abbreviations (p. 289), the bibliography (pp. 291-303), the indexes (pp. 305-326), the tables of contents (pp. 327-332) and of errata (p. 333), the book consists of two main parts.

The first part (pp. 13-76), a study of general points about intercommunion, contains a short historical account of the problem, and a presentation of

the possibilities of and the prerequisites for the *exact* or *economical* intercommunion with the heterodox.

In the second part (pp. 79-274), which refers to the relations with the heterodox in worship and outside it, the author has written seven chapters dealing with the relation of the Orthodox to the heterodox in the seven sacraments (the Eucharist, Baptism and Chrism, Ordination, Matrimony, Repentance and Extreme Unction), in the other ecclesiastical services, and outside worship.

In his prologue the author states that intercommunion with the heterodox has always been one of the Church's great problems. In the second half of the 19th and during the 20th centuries this problem was and still is a burning issue. In the vast areas of Australia, Africa and America with a predominant Anglican and Protestant majority and with a scarcity of Orthodox priests, intercommunion developed rapidly, until the Church was able to confront the situation and act accordingly (p. 39). The Orthodox were not suspicious of the Anglican Church, neither were the Anglicans of them. So members of both Churches had in their own church life different sorts of ecclesiastical relations. The book accordingly deals mainly with the relations between these two churches. The author stresses that before any scheme of union between Orthodox and non-Orthodox can be worked out, unity on dogmas or faith is essential, from the Orthodox point of view (pp. 68, 75). He constantly repeats that it is impossible to recognise the validity of sacraments performed outside the Orthodox Church. Only in the spirit of ecclesiastical Economy¹ can the validity of some of the sacraments of those entering the Orthodox Church be recognised. The author is very reserved about the presence of Orthodox laymen and clergy in the worship services of the heterodox. He presumably writes (pp. 48, 241-266) in the spirit of the Encyclical of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (1952), where it is stated that :

It is meet that Orthodox clerics who are delegates (of their Church) should be as careful as possible about services of worship in which they join with the heterodox, as these are contrary to the sacred canons and make less acute the confessional sensitiveness of the Orthodox. They should aim at celebrating, if possible, purely Orthodox liturgical services and rites, that they may thereby manifest, before the eyes of the heterodox, the splendour and majesty of Orthodox adoration².

On the other hand the participation of Orthodox in discussions and meetings with the heterodox is not only expressly permitted by the Canon, but

¹ HAMILCAR ALIVISATOS, *Economy according to the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church*, Athens : Aster, 1949 (in Greek).

JEROME KOTSONIS, *Problems of Ecclesiastical Economy*, Athens : Damascus, 1957 (in Greek).

² *The Ecumenical Review* 5 (1952/3), p. 169.

actually insisted upon (pp. 268-270). The organ which decides the matter of Intercommunion with the heterodox is the Ecumenical Council, or in its absence a Synod (p. 280).

Taking into consideration that the Rev. J. Kotsonis will, as stated in his prologue, appreciate any information or comments on the problem he studies, I will try to dwell on some particular points. In this book on Intercommunion only four pages of the introduction (pp. 7-10) are devoted to the meaning of this term, which is equivalent to the Greek *Koinonia* or *Epikoinonia*. But the author continually brings up this subject throughout the book. The problem of intercommunion with the Protestants was mainly recognised in the 18th century when the Nonjurors applied to the Eastern Churches (p. 13). But why not accept as equally important the relations between the two Christian bodies at the time of the Ecumenical Patriarch Jeremiah the Second and the theologians of Tübingen in the 16th century? Chronologically the book extends to our own time. The relations of Anglicans and Orthodox are studied in detail. Would it not be in keeping to have inserted a note on the attitude of the Moscow Conference (1948) towards the Anglican Church and the latest joint meetings of Anglicans and the members of the Orthodox Church of Russia (1955, 1956)? The author has avoided mentioning the fact that Orders in the Anglican Church are recognised by several Orthodox Churches. Is this done on purpose or not? ¹ On page 174 we find the decision of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 concerning the scheme then proposed for church union in South India. This scheme has recently been carried out (1947). In the reviewer's opinion an exposition of the Anglican Church's later decisions on this matter would have been useful for the Orthodox reader. On page 194 there is a note on the representation of the Ecumenical Patriarch in the West. The same Patriarchate has recently created another position, that of representative at the World Council of Churches headquarters in Geneva, occupied today by the Most Rev. the Metropolitan of Melita. I think I may be permitted to disagree with the author about the conferring of honorary Divinity Degrees on Orthodox Christians by Anglicans or Protestants (pp. 272-3). The different institutions attach no strings about recipients of Degrees having to accept the rightness of the Anglican or Protestant faith. The Rev. Fr. Paul Ballester Konvalier, now a priest in the Greek Orthodox Church and a student of the graduating class (June 1958) at the Theological School of Halki, before he entered the Orthodox Church, was only a monk and not a priest in the Roman Catholic Church (p. 184).

After a careful study of this book one feels glad that this subject of intercommunion has for the first time been treated so fully and ably from the

¹ JEROME KOTSONIS, *The validity of the Anglican Orders according to the Canon Law of the Orthodox Church*, published in *Theologia* (of Athens) 28 (1957), 354 ff. (in Greek).

Orthodox point of view. Although the author represents the more traditional tendencies in Orthodox theology, his writing is in no way polemical. "The purpose of this study is to serve the highest form of union among the Churches" (p. 282). Throughout the book the reader finds the spirit of love towards other Christians and a tendency to an objective, scientific and scrupulous definition of what is canonically right or wrong in the broad field of relations between the Orthodox and the heterodox. The Canons of the Church are presented and analysed critically, and the interpretations come out by themselves without any forcible application. Almost all questions on the attitude of Orthodoxy to the matter dealt with are answered in the Orthodox spirit. Dr. Kotsonis has made a valuable contribution to the literature of the ecumenical movement.

VASIL T. ISTAVRIDIS.

ORTHODOX BOOKS ON LAITY

THE POSITION OF THE LAITY WITHIN THE CHURCH, ACCORDING TO THE CANON LAW OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH (in Greek), *by J. KOTSONIS. Athens, 1956. 69 pp.*

DIE ROLLE DER LAIEN IM LEBEN DER RUSSISCHEN ORTHODOXEN KIRCHE, *by L. N. PARIJSKIJ. (Translated from the Russian and published in "Kirche in der Zeit," Jahrgang 1957, I, pp. 12-15).*

Archimandrite Dr. J. Kotsonis, Chaplain to the King of Greece, and member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, published the above treatise on the position of the laity in the Orthodox Church as a whole almost at the same time that Professor Parijskij (of Leningrad) gave an address in the Rhineland on the position of the laity in the Russian Orthodox Church. The aim of both authors is to portray the biblical understanding of the Church as the Body of Christ. Both authors emphasise that the difference between clergy and laity, as members with different functions serving the same Body, is not a difference of rank or of power, and that the Church is nothing — that it loses its spiritual character — unless it lives and acts through the "fulness" of *all* its members.

With loving care and conscientious exactitude Parijskij describes "the contribution of the laity in biblical exegesis, in preserving and extending the faith, in the services of worship, in church legislation and in church administration." In doing this he always refers to the Bible and to the resolutions of the Holy Synods, and he shows the variety in the latest developments in the Russian Church. Kotsonis gives a wealth of scholarly reasons and many historical details (which sometimes make it rather difficult to view the subject as a whole), to show the difference between "the cooperation of

the laity in the Church's work of sanctification, its work of teaching, and its work of administration."

Kotsonis traces the history of the laity in the Church back to the 5th century, on the basis of the latest research. Parijskij studies the same question until the present day by analysing also the statute of the Russian Orthodox Church from January 1945. Both of them show that the laity have almost completely ceased to exercise any influence in the supra-parochial assemblies (episcopal synods) of the Greek Churches of Hellas and Constantinople; whereas at the Russian "Landes-sobor" of 1917/18 "the laity played an important part in the discussions, even if only in an advisory capacity." The laity were also represented at the Sobor of January 1945, which elected Alexius as Patriarch and passed the ecclesiastical statute now in force; though the voting was confined to Bishops voting "on behalf of the clergy and the laity." Parijskij stresses the fact that in accordance with the Statute of 1945 (I, para. 7) the laity and the clergy could obtain a hearing through convening a "Landes-sobor" on two conditions: "if it is necessary, and if it is possible in practice." In conclusion Kotsonis declares: "If (which heaven forbid!) the clergy were to supersede the laity in the Orthodox Church and to oust them from power, then the watchman of Orthodoxy would be silenced; for — according to the Letter of the Orthodox Patriarch of 1848 (to which Parijskij appeals) — the watchman (Phylax) of Orthodoxy is the body of the Church, i.e. the congregation."

These two enquiries (Greek and Russian) into the position of the laity according to ecclesiastical law afford valuable proof of the far-reaching agreement between the Orthodox Churches on essential questions, despite the difference in their environments.

HILDEGARD SCHAEFER.

A REAL MOVEMENT FORWARD

DOCUMENTS ON CHRISTIAN UNITY. Fourth Series, 1948-1957, edited by G. K. A. BELL. *Oxford University Press, London, New York, Toronto, 1958. Pp. XVIII, 243. 21 s.*

The former Bishop of Chichester's fourth series of "Documents on Christian Unity" has conveniently collected the most important materials for ecumenical history since the Lambeth Conference of 1948, comprising 64 documents, Nos. 222-285.

The structure of the book is essentially similar to the preceding three series, although this latest series does not contain any documents concerning the Lesser Eastern and the Old Catholic Churches. Church union negotiations in the United Kingdom (Nos. 236-252) as well as in South India (Nos. 267-274) are particularly well documented. On the other hand, one would like

to have seen certain documents included referring to union discussions in the United States, but a selection will always remain a selection which cannot satisfy everyone, and the series presents as good a collection as can be expected in the space available. It includes for the first time documents indicating the attitude of the Russian Orthodox Church, Nos. 230, 231 (not 233 as is said in the introduction) and 235. — The Statement "The Calling of the Church to Mission and Unity" adopted in 1952 at Willingen by the Enlarged Meeting of the Committee of the International Missionary Council (No. 275), the Messages of the first two WCC Assemblies pertinent to the question of the unity of the Church and extracts from reports of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order, Lund 1952 (Nos. 276-285), are also included. — Six documents (Nos. 224-229) testify to the well-known "ecumenical" attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, among them the famous Holy Office instructions *Cum compertum* (June 5, 1948), and *Ecclesia Catholica* (December 20, 1949) and the in many ways impressive "Pastoral Letter on the occasion of the First Assembly of the WCC at Amsterdam from the Archbishop and Bishops of the Netherlands to the clergy and faithful entrusted to their charge." An introduction by the editor precedes the documents, pp. XIII-XVIII. It serves Dr. Bell as "an opportunity for a review of the period of nearly forty years, 1920-58, which the whole series covers" (p. XIII). This is the result: "There is beyond doubt need for a much greater sense of urgency on all sides; and there have been various disappointments and checks. But students of the whole period 1920-58 cannot fail to receive an impression of a real movement forward. The goal is the restoration of unity to the whole Church of Christ. And, in the words of the Report of the Faith and Order Section at the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches, 'the measure of our concern for unity is the degree to which we pray for it'" (p. XVIII).

The editor of this important series has had his share in making the ecumenical movement "a real movement forward." And all who have the privilege of knowing him realise that his great concern for unity did not tempt him to become a unity strategist but led him into prayer through which, in turn, he then became one of the most influential spiritual leaders of "the great new fact of our era."

H. H. HARMS.

ECUMENICAL SOCIAL THOUGHT

DIE ÖKUMENISCHEN ARBEITEN ZUR SOZIALEN FRAGE, by HANS TEN DOORNAKAAT. *Gotthelf-Verlag, Zurich/Frankfurt a. M., 1954, 274 pp. Sw. Fr. 14.—*

ÖKUMENISCHES CHRISTENTUM UND WIRTSCHAFT, by EMIL WASSER. P. G. Keller, Winterthur, 1957. 108 pp. Sw. Fr. 12.—

The special value of *Hans ten Doornkaat's* summary of ecumenical studies and pronouncements on the social question is its careful arrangements of the material according to sociological categories. It is from this point of view, as he rightly points out, that the development of the movement for Life and Work, which reached its culmination in the reports of the Amsterdam Assembly on responsible society and international questions, must be analysed, to be properly understood. Not the theological differences between confessions, but the differing social experiences and concepts in the Anglo-Saxon and Continental European worlds, determined Christian thinking on social questions up to Amsterdam. Ten Doornkaat distinguishes society, or community, in the English sense of the word from "Gesellschaft, Volk und Staat" as understood in the German context, and points out that it was the former which dominated the discussion at Stockholm, Oxford and Amsterdam, leading up to the concept "responsible society." In the definition of the English word "society," the author reflects the confusion in English and American thinking which was expressed especially in the preparatory volumes for the Oxford Conference. In general, however, he points out that the emphasis lies on human relations with one another in the present, on sharing of life rather than on the givenness of a historical group, or a unifying spirit. On the one hand, this empiricism is a healthy correction of all the false romanticism implicit in the Germanic idea of "Volk." On the other hand, however, it runs the danger of falling into an individualism which neglects the relatedness of human nature itself. An excellent summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the concept "responsible society" is to be found on pages 50-52. Doornkaat points rightly to the growing Christo-centralism of ecumenical thinking on social questions as a deepening of this concept. The same emphasis is found in his analysis of ecumenical thinking about the state and economic order. In so far as Doornkaat is able to trace any line of theological development in ecumenical pronouncements, it runs from the rather shallow social Gospel idealism in Stockholm toward a deeper understanding, first of human sin and the tension between the Kingdom of God and the order of the world, then to a clearer understanding of the significance of eschatology and of the Lordship of Christ. His analysis, therefore, although written before the Evanston Assembly, is valuable in pointing out the direction of ecumenical thinking toward the strong emphasis on hope which characterised that Assembly. It forms an excellent handbook for the student who seeks a thematic understanding of these questions and a guide to the ecumenical literature itself, which is enumerated in a very good bibliography at the back.

The work of *Emil Wasser* limits itself to tracing discussion of the economic question in ecumenical thinking since the beginning of the Life and Work movement. It has the advantage of carrying this discussion up through the Evanston Assembly. It also contains an excellent bibliography in German,

French and English, and a rapid historical survey of the various conferences which the Life and Work movement held up to Amsterdam 1948. The impression gained from Dr. Wasser's book is that these conferences and assemblies were remarkably untheological in their approach to the economic question, depending on the whole on idealism tempered by an increasing understanding of human sin. This impression is partly justified by the facts. But one feels that the author would have done better to have abandoned the concept "ökumenisches Christentum," instead of adopting it as if it were an entity capable of producing ideas of itself. The actual process of ecumenical thinking is more diverse than an examination of the ecumenical documents in themselves reveals. Nevertheless, as a guide to the pronouncements of various ecumenical conferences on a number of different subjects related to the economic problem — communism and capitalism, property, social education, international order, etc. — this book is helpful.

CHARLES C. WEST.

A MAJOR FEATURE OF CHRISTIANITY'S EXPANSION

WORLD SERVICE — A History of the Foreign Work and World Service of the Young Men's Christian Associations of the United States and Canada, by KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. *Association Press, New York, 1957, 489 pp. \$5.00.*

This book is a valuable addition to the literature dealing with the missionary outreach that came from North America in the 19th and 20th centuries. The contribution to missions by men like John R. Mott, Robert P. Wilder, Luther Wishard, Charles K. Ober, and Sherwood Eddy — YMCA secretaries all — is well known; so too is the contribution of the YMCAs of the U.S.A. and Canada through student associations and conferences (Mt-Hermon) and the founding of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions "to the decisions which sent out under the several mission boards thousands of the youth of both countries to almost every land."

The direct missionary activity of the YMCAs of the USA and Canada in what was first called "foreign work" and then beginning in the 1930's "world service" is less well known. This well-documented history (1746 footnotes, almost entirely referring to "original sources") tells the story of what is in effect a lay, interdenominational, specialized missionary society, at present referred to as the International Committee of the YMCAs of the U.S.A. and Canada. This is different from the World Alliance of YMCAs with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, although they are often confused, even in YMCA circles.

The Secretaries of the International Committee were seldom the pioneer representatives of Christianity in a new field. Its policy has been only to enter a field when there was a demand from already established Christian bodies. It sought to perform specialized functions, particularly among youth and thus "built on, re-enforced, and complemented what was being done by church missions." The purpose was to help bring into being strong, indigenous YMCA movements — "self-governing, self-supporting, self-propagating." Assistance was in the form of secretaries from North America, contributions for buildings, and special grants to National YMCA Committees. The secretary was "to work himself out of a job," discovering and training "nationals" to take the executive responsibility.

Since 1889, when the first "foreign secretaries" of the International Committee sailed for Japan and India, some 707 secretaries have been on its roster. They have assisted in the founding or strengthening of YMCAs in over 40 countries. One indication of how well they have done their task is that YMCAs exist in all those countries today except 7 in Eastern Europe and Cuba. An indication of how unsuccessful they have been in "working themselves out of a job" is that of the 33 countries where YMCAs still exist and where North American secretaries have served, there are still "fraternal secretaries" in 25 including Japan and India.

In the early years these men were given tremendous latitude to try cutting-edge experiments, and creative new methods in Christian mission. "As one of them said, 'They were thrown into next week and were expected to dig their way out.' Most of them did. Again and again Mott stated as the ideal that they were to 'see further than other men see, see what other men cannot see, and see it first.'" Inevitably as time passed the work became institutionalized, often building-centred, and some of the early creativity of response was lost. Has the effect of "organization man" on missions and churches been sufficiently studied?

It is perhaps well to note some of the "special features" of this missionary enterprise, some of them reaching far beyond the strengthening or founding of YMCAs. For these men sought not just the extension of the YMCA, but of the Kingdom of God — and to influence the lives of whole peoples and nations through their youth. The slogan that drove them was "the evangelization of the world in this generation" and both "evangelization" and "world" were given a far larger connotation than is usual in this phrase. The Student Volunteer Movement has been mentioned. Other special features can only be named: Committee on Friendly Relations among Foreign Students (foreign missions at home); evangelistic tours by Mott and Eddy; special approaches to intelligentsia by Mackay and Monzo; literature production — Farquhar in India and Berdyaev in Russian; Mass Education Movement in China (Jimmy Yen); the College of Chinese Studies in Peking; rural

reconstruction in India, Mexico and Korea; the Institute of Pacific Relations (delegates to the founding Conference were selected by National YMCAs); World Y Tours; the geographic spread of the Olympic Games Committee and stimulus to Latin American Games, the Far Eastern Games; and whenever these secretaries have been — a stimulus to Christian cooperation and in some cases church union.

This history has a limited scope — to tell the story of the contributions of the YMCAs of the U.S.A. and Canada; it is not, as Dr. Latourette makes clear, a history of the movements assisted. Thus one regrets a statement such as "From the perspective of the mid-1950's the years 1920-22 were seen to mark the apex of the activity of the YMCAs in China." That the North American participation reached its peak in those years is clear but are the two peaks necessarily the same? This is hardly a question that can be answered only from the point of view of the contributing body, particularly at the present juncture in world history. It raises a more basic question as to whether the moment is psychologically opportune to write of the specific North American contribution to YMCAs around the world. That however was not Dr. Latourette's decision but that of the "Committee on Historical Resources" which "commissioned" him to write this book.

One could wish that one of the original points in the "commission" were more amply dealt with, namely the relations of World Service to the World Alliance of YMCAs. The very brief and inadequate references to these relations tend to reflect thought patterns and situations of several generations ago and often give the impressions that the World Alliance is somehow over against the International Committee as another "sending body," but doing less because of inadequate resources and staff. The role of the Extension Committee of the World Alliance as the body in which all National Movements share in the planning and coordination of the world service or extension work of them all is not made clear; nor is the fact that the Extension Committee of the World Alliance has no budget and sends no secretaries. The findings of the 1953 World Conference on Extension Policies are not given, as well they might be, for these have been stated to be the policy that now guides the World Service of the International Committee.

This book renders a great service to those who would seek to understand "a major feature of that expansion of Christianity which in the 19th and 20th centuries gave the faith a global spread" and should be studied carefully by those who have a share in the planning of its future.

ROBBINS STRONG.

A DISTURBING PREACHER

REDEN 1955-1957, by MARTIN NIEMÖLLER. 2. Auflage. *Stimme der Gemeinde, Darmstadt.* 240 pp. DM 6.90.

The fact that the first edition of this book was sold out within a few weeks shows that it is of intense current interest. Niemöller, who was a submarine commander in the first world war, a pastor of the Confessing Church in the Third Reich and then Hitler's prisoner, is sometimes criticised as a "Pastor meddling in politics." What he does, however, is impelled not by politics in itself but by obedience to Scripture. It was this obedience which impelled him under the Third Reich to make a stand against the Aryan Laws, because "baptism cannot be replaced by a genealogical tree." The present book clearly shows that he still feels impelled — both as a Christian and as a citizen — to be guided by his conscience, in the light of God's Word.

The motives and arguments which spring from faith cannot be fully appreciated unless they are proclaimed openly. That is why Niemöller cannot remain silent. He wants to open the eyes of people who hesitate or who lack courage. He once said to Hitler, "No power in the world, not even yours as Chancellor of the Reich, can exonerate us from the responsibility which God has placed upon us for Germany, our fatherland." It is this sense of responsibility which forces Niemöller to speak out now that he is sixty-six years old, without troubling whether people agree or disagree with him.

In his speeches Niemöller does not confine himself to spheres in which he is uncommitted, nor to historical considerations. He is aggressive, challenging, he forces his audience to take a definite decision one way or the other. Every one of the 25 addresses reveals how the Christian message works like salt in every sphere of existence as an integrating or destructive force. There are burning questions which must be tackled, such as the problems of the reunification of Germany or of work for peace, or the problems confronting Protestantism today. They are all clarion calls to a Christian Church which is all too prone to lie down and sleep the sleep of the just. According to Niemöller, Germany — situated as it is between East and West — can only exist if it ceases to be a power-factor on either side (page 31). Niemöller also sharply criticises sterile "churchiness": "If the Church imagines that it is an end in itself then it is a menace to Christianity, because it misuses its influence over people, compelling them to submit and be obedient to it instead of offering them faith and trust through preaching their true Lord" (p. 45). Niemöller is like a preacher in the wilderness of a Church which is no longer sure where its own centre is. No wonder that many churchmen turn against this disturbing witness.

Actually Niemöller is not concerned about conforming with the trends which happen to be fashionable in the Church. He is not interested merely

in doing as "one" does. He therefore constantly challenges people to contradict him. But at the same time it must be recognised that Niemöller sincerely desires to understand his fellow-men, even those who think differently from himself, to understand the experience which leads them to different conclusions and to recognise them, just as much as those who share his own views, as brothers in Christ for whom God sent His Son.

All the speeches, which can now be read quietly and without prejudice, radiate absolute confidence that the living God will be victorious and that we have a strong refuge in Him amid all the storms and floods of the void seething around us. Nor must we fail to mention how the book is enriched by Niemöller's expressive wealth of language. A careful study of this book shows that the ultimate concern is to secure the sphere of personal freedom, and to show that God's claims are total, excluding all other claims, not only in relation to God but also in our intercourse with our fellow-men.

Of course, Niemöller cannot relieve us of the difficult task of making our own decisions. He does not want people to be mere followers of human authority. But this book creates a tension in the reader from which he will certainly benefit.

P. WIESER.

QUESTIONS AND TASKS IN ASIA

KIRCHEN IM NEUEN ASIEN. Eindrücke einer Studienreise, by WALTER FREYTAG.
Evangelischer Missionsverlag G.m.b.H., Stuttgart, 1958 (Weltmission heute, Heft 7/8). 64 pp. DM 2.40.

The chairman of the Committee of the Division of Studies of the World Council of Churches shares with a wider public in this all too brief report, the impressions gained during his journey to New Guinea, Indonesia, India, and China. After reading this account they can only encourage the author to present them as soon as possible with the promised more comprehensive description and evaluation of the situation as he sees it. Dr. Freytag was no newcomer in the countries and churches he visited, and many people were looking forward to his interpretation of the life and task of the churches in a new Asia. This very condensed report indicates the complexities of the situation as well as the tasks not only of the Asian churches but also of the "older" parts of Christendom. It sketches the "new Asia," pictures at some length church life in New Guinea, deals more briefly with the churches in Indonesia, India, and China, and then sums up the author's observations in a chapter on the churches' real situation in modern Asia, only to turn round and ask penetrating questions which the Asian churches put to their older brethren in the West.

H. H. HARMS.

BUILDING A NEW INDIA

INDIA TODAY!, by JACK FINEGAN. *The Bethany Press, St. Louis, Missouri, 1955. 208 pp. \$4.25.*

German edition: INDIEN. Deutsche Bearbeitung von Fritz Bolle. Mit 20 Bildtafeln. "Knaur Buch," Droemersch Verlaganstalt, München, 1955, 157 pp. DM 5.80.

CULTURAL FOUNDATIONS OF INDIAN DEMOCRACY, edited by P. D. DEVANANDAN and M. M. THOMAS. *YMCA Publishing House, Calcutta, 1955. 110 pp. Rs. 1.50.*

POLITICAL OUTLOOK IN INDIA TODAY: A Pre-election Study, by J. R. CHANDRAN and M. M. THOMAS. *Committee for Literature on Social Concerns, Bangalore, 1956. 176 pp. Rs. 3.50.*

THE REVOLT OF ASIA, by CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. *Sheed and Ward, London, 1957. 48 pp. 3 s. 6 d.*

This rather haphazard collection of books gives a good impression of the forces, or at least of some of them, that shape modern India.

Dr. *Finegan* is Director of the Palestine Institute of Archeology, Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation at the Pacific School of Religion, and minister of University Christian Church in Berkeley, California. Being thus a many-sided personality he brought special gifts to bear upon his studies on present-day India during a year's stay in India on a Fulbright scholarship. The outcome is a scholarly, well balanced and exceedingly good book on a difficult subject. Two well-known Indians, Dr. P. D. Devanandan and Dr. V. E. Devadutt confirm the fact that the author has given a faithful picture of contemporary India. Indeed, whether he deals with archeology, population, economics and social life, or pursues the trends of history, or recounts the feats of the climbers on Mt. Everest and other perilous peaks, or describes the working of democracy in modern India — he presents it all in a fascinating manner, shedding light on many of India's intricate problems. Of special interest are the two last chapters on the religions in India and the place of Christianity.

I noticed two mistakes which should be corrected in a new edition. Vasco da Gama was not the first European who arrived on the Malabar coast (p. 55); quite a few did so before him, e.g. Marco Polo and a number of R. C. missionaries. And: Dr. John Thomas, the companion of William Carey, was not the first medical missionary in India (p. 184); he was preceded by no less than five medical missionaries in the Tranquebar Mission of whom Caspar Gottlieb Schlegelmilch was the first to come to India in 1730.

The German edition of Dr. *Finegan's* book is remarkable for its cheapness and the excellent pictures.

The booklet of *P. D. Devanandan* and his co-editor is less satisfactory. Though it introduces the reader to much of India's cultural and spiritual heritage and its bearing on the present situation, it leaves him — at least the critical Westerner — unconvinced that these lofty ideals of old can be realized in the stern realities of a modern state. To give an example: *Bharata Kumarappa* deals with the significance of *sarvodaya*. Ghandi who coined this term meant by it the welfare of all, irrespective of distinctions of wealth or class, as the goal of social order. But even in a democracy a centralized government rules by the decisions of a majority and by force. Now *Kumarappa* pleads for a decentralisation of Government and the establishment of local governments which would administer their affairs through *panchayats*, or executive committees — the district, provincial, and national administrations to act merely as co-ordinating agencies. Production too ought to be decentralised in the villages. Are such proposals not mere dreams? Or take the contribution of *Acharya J. B. Kripalani*. Speaking for the Praja Socialist Party as against the Congress, the Communists and the Jana Sangh, he takes up a similar plea. Is he a dreamer too? The other contributors avoid such pitfalls, but what they write remains rather theoretical. *Minoo Masani* and *Nissim Ezekiel* emphasize the importance of secular humanism, and *M. B. Niyogi* traces the indigenous democratic foundations found in Indian history and society, whereas *K. A. Nilakanta Sastri* and *M. Yamunacharya* discuss the religious resources in Hinduism, stressing the dignity of the individual and concern for one's neighbour. Finally, *Father Jerome D'Souza*, deals with the contribution of Christianity, confining himself to the Christian teaching about the rights of the individual and his relationship to the state.

The chief aim of the booklet edited by *J. R. Chandran* and *M. M. Thomas* is to relate the relevant facts about the political parties in India for the benefit of the Christian voter. Beyond that, it happens to be a most helpful introduction for the foreigner to the political life of present-day India. The different parties are given four chapters: the Congress Party, the Socialist Parties, the Communal Parties (e.g. the Hindu Mahasabha, the Rajya Parishad, the All-India Muslim League, the Scheduled Castes Federation, the Indian Christian Associations), and the Communist Party. There are three more chapters on elections in a democracy, the goal of New India, and Christian insights for politics. The contributors are all of them leading Christians in India, but it is not stated which chapters were written by the different authors.

Last, but not least, we have to refer to the small, weighty study by *Christopher Dawson*, the well-known English cultural philosopher, who regards religion as the key to history. He approaches the problem of the Asian Revolt by carefully analysing the texture of the oriental national movements on the one side and of the oriental cultures on the other side. In the course of this stimulating treatise he draws attention "to the remarkable paradox that a

movement which is rallying the peoples of Asia and Africa against the West is at the same time removing the cultural barriers between them and doing all in its power to diffuse Western education, Western science and Western political ideologies" (p. 35). "If a common Asian society is emerging, it is not due to any religious or philosophical synthesis, but to the new secular Westernised culture that is common to them all" (p. 42). As regards the missionary approach to these nations, the author mentions three spheres to work in: the intelligentsia, the peasants, and the population of the big cities. It seems worth-while to ponder over his question: "Is it not possible, . . . that the key points of oriental Christianity will be found in the great urban centres like Calcutta and Bombay, Tokyo, Shanghai, Canton, Singapore — that the new churches will find their future leaders in the same urban cosmopolitan classes from which the leaders of the primitive Church were drawn?" (p. 48). This little, thought-provoking booklet sees India rightly as a part of Asia. It deserves to be read and re-read, and to be studied and re-studied.

PAUL GÄBLER.

AMERICAN CHURCHES AND THE NEGRO

AMERICAN CHURCHES AND THE NEGRO. An historical study from early slave days to the present, by W. D. WEATHERFORD. *The Christopher Publishing House, Boston, U.S.A., 1957. 310 pp. \$3.50.*

In writing this book the author has drawn on material from a large number of different sources: statements by churches, resolutions passed by synods, biographies and other documents containing information about the attitude of the churches in America to the negroes there. He examines the attitude of the following churches and denominations to the negroes: the Anglican Episcopalians, the Quakers, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Lutherans, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists and the Roman Catholics. He explains the policies and activities of these churches with regard to their present work among the negroes. The author has four aims in view: 1. To describe what American Christians knew about the negroes up to the 19th century and what they did to tell them about Christianity. 2. To show that the old planters in the Southern States knew their negroes better than modern Christians do. 3. To describe the present interest of the Church in the religious life of the negroes. 4. From these facts to show the compelling necessity for true community with the negroes.

The first (and longest) part of the book constantly reverts, naturally, to the attitude to slavery. With the exception of the Quakers, none of the Christian churches rejected slavery as such. The modern conviction that slavery is incompatible with Christianity prevailed only gradually, and sometimes

involved struggles. On the other hand all the churches from the very outset insisted that the Christian message must be passed on to the slaves who had been brought to America as pagans. In many cases their white masters recognised this task and carried it out. They often even attended the same services and celebrated communion together. If separate services were sometimes held for the negroes during those centuries, the reason was often pedagogical. Most of the negroes were illiterate and their conceptions and way of thinking were so different from those of white people that separate services were sometimes arranged for them so as to adapt and explain things better to them.

The book contains many valuable insights. It is written objectively and avoids the pitfall of criticising past events in the light of present-day views. It may also prove helpful today in churches where racial differences are still a problem.

ERNST DAMMANN.

ECUMENICAL DISSERVICE

CHRISTEN SUCHEN EINE KIRCHE. Die Ökumenische Bewegung und Rom. Mit Dokumenten und soziographischen Beilagen, by J. P. MICHAEL. Verlag Herder, Freiburg, 1958. (*Herder-Bücherei, Band 10*). 188 pp. DM 1.90.

Summing up his "Notes on Roman Catholic Writings concerning Ecumenism," Dr. Visser 't Hooft writes: "In conclusion I would say that we have now to do with two types of Roman Catholic ecumenism (sometimes the two can be distinguished in the writings of one and the same person). There is an ecumenism of the 'outsider,' who looks at the ecumenical movement as a strange and disturbing phenomenon. There is the ecumenism of the 'insider' who, even though his Church is not in the World Council, feels that in what happens to-day in the whole field of interchurch relations and the search for unity *sua res agitur* and who is therefore existentially involved in it" (*Ecumenical Review*, vol. VIII, No. 2, p. 197). Dr. Michael's book does not easily fall under one of the two categories. He certainly combines the two types but in a very special way. He is definitely an "insider" — before the Amsterdam Assembly as an Evangelical Christian in Germany he contributed to its preparation, and his contribution was published in the German Amsterdam volume *Die Ordnung Gottes und die Unordnung der Welt*. His book, here under review, testifies to the fact that he still is an "insider." But — and this is the secret tragedy of his book and of all the reporting he does on the ecumenical movement in the very respectable Roman Catholic Monthly, the *Herder-Korrespondenz* — can he dare to be an

"insider"? Dr. Michael joined the Church of Rome on Nov. 1, 1950, the very day when Pope Pius XII proclaimed the dogma of the Assumption of Mary into Heaven. *Must* he since then not be an "outsider" even more so than those who have been Roman Catholics all their Christian lives? His book presents a pastoral problem much more than a psychological problem, which could be dismissed far more easily. It may justly be characterised as an *Apologia pro vita sua*. Only if one keeps this very personal involvement of the author constantly in mind can one do justice to a book which combines in fact, in a particular way, the "insider's" existentialist concern and the "outsider's" limitations of insight and understanding.

The reviewer has for years followed attentively Dr. Michael's reports on the ecumenical movement in the *Herder-Korrespondenz*. He has been grateful on the one hand for the wide space this important monthly has been giving to ecumenical questions and developments, and on the other he must confess to having many a time reached the point where he was tempted to denounce publicly the massive distortions and wild speculations based on nothing but the unlimited fantasy of the reporter. (Readers may remember in particular some fantastic statements made in connection with the Lund Conference on Faith and Order in 1952 which, although officially denied by the General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, were never corrected in the *Herder-Korrespondenz*.) Dr. Michael's present book, having grown out of his contributions to the *Herder-Korrespondenz*, bears — unfortunately — the same characteristics. It deals with the ecumenical movement, to be sure, but what an ecumenical movement! He knows facts, but many of them only in part. Others become distorted in his presentation because of his gift of putting together unrelated facts; and where there are no suitable facts, they can easily be invented. Space does not permit us to go into details. There is scarcely a page in my copy of Dr. Michael's book without question marks, exclamation marks and other signs of disagreement with his presentation. It should be understood, however, that this criticism does not refer to differences of theological opinion — after all, there *are* questions on which Christians within the ecumenical movement and Roman Catholics are not agreed, and no one in the ecumenical movement would deny the right of Roman Catholics to disagree violently with the World Council of Churches' theological presuppositions and their consequences. It is not that. But the criticism applies to Dr. Michael's construction of a phantom which he then calls the ecumenical movement or World Council of Churches and presents as such to his readers. Because the World Council of Churches by its very nature, and its member churches, must seek a real theological discussion with the Church of Rome, one must repudiate misrepresentations like those of Dr. Michael which are obstacles to a real conversation with Rome and have just the opposite effect to what Dr. Michael says he wants to have.

Nobody would be helped if Christians outside Rome distorted this church's life and teaching in order to dismiss it more easily, and we resist any such attempt from the other side even if it is clothed with sympathetic phrases and open-mindedness.

It is not Dr. Michael's point of view as a Roman Catholic that causes the reviewer's protest — Dr. Michael has every right to think and judge as a Roman Catholic (if he so desires) and he will be taken seriously as such —, but it is the reporter's hopelessly distorted perspective, completely out of focus with historic accuracy and the facts accessible to any serious scholar and responsible journalist. This perspective is so false that even a legion of corrections will not set it right. Only a mind freed from the inner tensions of the author's restlessness and inconsistency, which are so obvious in this book, will be able to achieve what Dr. Michael set out to do: to contribute to a real ecumenical conversation between his new church and that part of Christendom which he left, and where nevertheless he has discovered things that — in accordance with his theory — should never have been found there because they are signs of Christ's body outside the Church of Rome. And it is this fact which seems to disquiet him. This seems to be the reason for his becoming a "terrible simplificateur" who does a serious disservice particularly to his Roman Catholic readers, concealing from them the deepest dimensions of the ecumenical problem.

A few details may be mentioned in passing. Time and again he refers to the report of Section I of the Evanston Assembly and quotes particularly the following phrase: "The New Testament conceives of the Unity of the Church, not as sociological, but as having its essential reality in Christ Himself and in His indissoluble unity with His people." This statement, to Dr. Michael, is a "fatal" statement (p. 119) which "cannot be proved" and he refers the fathers of this statement back to Kittel's New Testament Dictionary and its article on the Church (p. 142). Dr. Michael is completely unable to admit that it is precisely this sentence that states a truth he himself is fighting for: the Church can never be understood as growing from below as a sum of sociological entities but can only be understood as Christ's body, as a gift from above. Had Dr. Michael only read Kittel's Church article himself, he would have received some help. I refer him particularly to vol. III, p. 515, llff. — On p. 28 f. Dr. Michael states that the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order did not discuss the basic dogmatic questions, because it was too early for that. And then he goes on to enumerate the topics that actually were discussed: "The call to unity — The Church's Message to the World: the Gospel — The nature of the Church — The Church's common confession of faith — The Church's ministry — The Sacraments — The Unity of Christendom and the relation thereto of existing churches."

Unfortunately he does not indicate what to his mind are the really basic dogmatic questions which a conference should have discussed!

And finally one must resist the growth of one myth at the outset. On p. 17 Dr. Michael writes: "Even if there is no official antagonism from the World Council of Churches against the Roman Catholic Church, but on the contrary many a fruitful personal exchange between them, the fact of this ecumenical foundation has a certain aggressive tendency against Rome, particularly since Pope Pius XII, as did his predecessor Pius XI, has refused invitations to participate in world conferences of churches." First: who shows antagonism, the one who extends an invitation or the one who refuses to accept it? But more important: Pope Pius XII never had a chance of refusing an invitation to participate in a World Council of Churches' Assembly because he never received one, and it is pure invention to say that Rome has been invited over and over again to World Council meetings (p. 160). Dr. Michael can find the details and the reasons for them in the "History of the Ecumenical Movement," edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill, chapter 15.

On p. 113 we read: "In the World Council of Churches there is a conscience at work orientated towards Christ. The World Council, in its structure so utterly opposed to the Greek-Orthodox Church, the representatives of which it not only tolerates but wants to have in its midst, faces squarely their truly Catholic questions. In the same way its leading officers are seeking constant contact with authorised theologians of the Roman Catholic Church. One cannot ask for more." The World Council of Churches, however, asks for more. It asks for partners who are willing to face facts and whose concern is truth and nothing but truth, even historic accuracy. The tragedy in Dr. Michael's book is that the author is himself persuaded to have good will—and the reviewer will not deny that—but that because of his very special personal involvement his limitations are so narrow that he cannot see facts, or at least not admit them.

H. H. HARMS.

THE WORLD IN ANOTHER NUTSHELL

WORLD CHRISTIAN HANDBOOK, 1957 edition, *edited by* E. J. BINGLE † and SIR KENNETH GRUBB. *World Dominion Press, London, 1957, pp. XXII and 312. 15 s.*

The 1949 and 1952 editions of this Handbook have already given ample proof of the need and usefulness of such a tool for everyone who in his research or other work needs plain facts and figures about the churches. The present edition excludes all other material (there are no articles on particular churches

or phases of church life) and limits itself to statistics and a directory only, except for a brief interpretative preface by Sir Kenneth Grubb. In it he pays tribute to his co-editor, E. J. Bingle, to whose painstaking accuracy most of the published material is due and who died before the work was done, and analyses with his penetrating mind some recent developments in the Christian world.

"The statistical tables which follow have been compiled along the same lines as those included in the 1952 edition of *World Christian Handbook*, with some slight modifications and expansions" (p. 3). As the editor indicates elsewhere, "generally speaking, statistics in the book are, with occasional corrections and additions, those which the organizations in question have returned to the editors. But the omissions are many, due to lack of replies in spite of repeated applications." The reviewer must confess to being unable to understand why such a lack of cooperation should be a sign of a particularly deeply rooted Christian faith, and can only express the strong hope that all church organizations will be prepared to cooperate in the preparation of an even more comprehensive and more accurate fourth edition of the Handbook, even if there is the widest variation in the use of the term "member."

The statistics include two new sections: figures for the world's Jewish population and certain totals for other religions.

The very useful and amazingly complete directory of Christian Churches and Missions is brought up to date.

The editor's explanation of the purpose of the Handbook in the 1949 edition still holds true: "Churches . . . should have the facts about their fellow-churches and about the world readily at their disposal. They can get some of them in this Handbook." It can only be hoped that this helpful book will be more and more used in the churches.

H. H. HARMS.

SHORT NOTICES

DOCTRINAL DECLARATIONS. A Collection of Official Statements on the Doctrinal Position of Various Lutheran Bodies in America. *Concordia Publishing House, Saint Louis, Missouri, 1957. 116 pp. \$1.00.*

This is a very useful collection of doctrinal statements of various Lutherans bodies in America. A first part records the confessional paragraphs of the constitutions of the larger Lutheran organisations; a second, much larger section presents more comprehensive doctrinal declarations, thus facilitating a careful analysis of the doctrinal differences among Lutherans in America.

Statistics for 1955 on Lutheran Churches in the United States and Canada are also included. More historic details from the individual documents than are now given would make this collection even more helpful.

HEILIGE SIND ANDERS, by KARL FÄRBER. *Verlag Herder, Freiburg i. Br., 1958 (Herder-Bücherei). 187 pp. DM 1.90.*

These fifty brief portraits of Christians of all centuries, well known and little known, whom the Roman Church has canonised, attempt to picture real human beings whose lives were touched by God's grace. They illustrate the riches of God's ways with men and illuminate the fact that "sanctity" in New Testament teaching is something different from the vulgar — Roman and non-Roman — understanding of a "saint." Particularly impressive is the sketch of Pope Celestine, the only Pope who abdicated — because of humility.

DIE WICHTIGSTEN GLAUBENSENTSCHEIDUNGEN UND GLAUBENSBEKENNTNISSE DER KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHE, edited by RUDOLF PEIL. *Verlag Herder, Freiburg i. Br., 1958, 2nd enlarged edition, pp. XIII, 85. DM 3.80.*

This small booklet, first published in 1938, makes readily accessible a German translation of a selection of the most important dogmatic statements of the Roman Church in historic order. A systematic index facilitates use.

LA SUISSE PROTESTANTE UNIE POUR MIEUX SERVIR, by EMILE MARION. *Fédération des Eglises protestantes de la Suisse. Editions Labor et Fides, Genève, 1958. 72 pp. Sw. Fr. 2.—*

German edition :

DIE PROTESTANTISCHE SCHWEIZ. Schweizerischer Evangelischer Kirchenbund. *Ursprung und Geschichte, by EMILE MARION. Evangelischer Verlag AG, Zollikon. 63 pp. Sw.-Fr. 2.90.*

The author gives a very brief description of the history of the different Protestant cantonal churches of the country in which the World Council of Churches has its headquarters. The main part of the brochure is devoted to the coming into being and the present work of the Swiss Federation of Protestant Churches. Statistics and a directory of the central church offices as well as of the Federation would have made this little guide much more useful.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ABINGDON PRESS, New York :
Gabriel and Dorothy Fackre, *Under the Steeple* (128 pp. ; \$2.—).
- G. ALLEN AND UNWIN, London :
Henry J. Cadbury, *Quakerism and Early Christianity*. Swarthmore Lecture 1957 (48 pp. ; 6s. bound, 4s. 6d. broch.).
- AMERICAN CHURCH PUBLICATIONS, New York :
Reformation and Catholicity. A Statement. Commentaries edited by J. Loos and J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink (47 pp.).
- THE AMERICAN PRESS, New York :
J. Clyde Yates, *Our Marching Orders in Evangelism*. A practical guidebook. (152 pp. ; \$2.75).
- THE BANGALORE PRESS, Bangalore City :
The Communist Rule in Kerala and Christian Responsibility. Always Study Conference Aug. 14-17, 1957 (50 pp.).
- THE BELKNAP PRESS OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass. :
John Norton, *The Answer to the Whole Set of Questions of the Celebrated Mr. William Apollonius, Pastor of the Church of Middleburg Looking toward the Resolution of Certain Controversies Concerning Church Government . . .* Translated from the Latin by Douglas Horton (196 pp. ; \$4.75).
- THE BOBBS-MERRILL CO., Indianapolis :
Samuel Terrien, *Job : Poet of Existence* (253 pp. ; \$3.75).
- BOSTON STARR KING PRESS, Boston :
Franklin Hamlin Littell, *The Free Church* (171 pp. ; \$6.—).
- THE BRITISH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, London :
The Church and Industry. An interpretation of each to the other (40 pp. ; 1s.).
- THE BRUCE PUBLISHING COMPANY, Milwaukee :
William J. Whalen, *Separated Brethren*. A Survey of Non-Catholic Christian Denominations in the United States (284 pp. ; \$4.50).
- BUCHHANDLUNG DES ERZIEHUNGSVEREINS, Neukirchen, Kr. Moers.
Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament XV/2 Hans-Joachim Kraus, Psalmen (81-160 pp. ; DM 7.—).
Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament. Ezechiel, by Walther Zimmerli (XIII/4) Dodekapropheten, Hosea, by Hans Walter Wolff (XIV/2) ; Psalmen, by Hans-Joachim Kraus (XV/1). (approx. 80 pp. each ; DM 7.— each).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge :

Owen Chadwick, *From Bossuet to Newman, the Idea of Doctrinal Development* (254 pp. ; 25s.).

Norman Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737* (2 vols. 366 & 289 pp. ; 84s. the 2 vols.).

This book has already been reviewed in the *Ecumenical Review*, Vol. X, No. 3, pp. 336-341 (April 1958). Since then the publishers have generously sent us a copy for use in the library of the World Council of Churches at Geneva, where it is available for study. Our warm thanks to the publishers.

CASTERMAN, Tournai :

Charles Burgard, *La Bible dans la liturgie* (195 pp. ; Fr. b. 69.—).

Jean Laloup, *Bible et classicisme* (299 pp. ; Fr. b. 84.—).

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF RELIGION AND SOCIETY, Bangalore :

Bulletin, Vol. IV, No. 2, Sept. 1957 : *The Changing Pattern of Family in India*, by M. P. John, A. P. Barnabas, K. V. Rajan, R. W. Taylor (65 pp. ; 3 Rs.).

Bulletin, Vol. IV, No. 3, Dec. 1957 : *Christian Approach to Sarvodaya*, by V. C. Samuel, H. Jai Singh, etc. (85 pp. ; Rs. 2.—).

J. CLARKE, London :

Brooke Foss Westcott, *The Gospel according to St. John*. The Authorised Version with introduction and notes. A new Introduction by Adam Fox (307 pp. ; 18s. 6d.).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo. :

W. Arndt, *Bible Difficulties* (176 pp. \$1.50).

W. Arndt, *Does the Bible Contradict Itself? A discussion of alleged contradictions in the Bible*. 5th ed. (173 pp.).

Heinrich Bornkamm, *Luther's World of Thought*. Translated by Martin H. Bertram (315 pp. ; \$3.—).

Christopher F. Drewes, *Introduction to the Books of the Bible* (233 pp. ; \$1.50).

DELACHAUX ET NIESTLÉ, Neuchâtel, Paris :

Roger Mehl, *Du Catholicisme romain*. Approche et interprétation. Cahiers théologiques, 40 (96 pp.).

Max Thurian, *La confirmation*. Consécration des laïcs (123 pp. ; Fr. 4.70).

DOUBLEDAY AND CO., New York :

Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. The Haskell Lectures 1956-1957 (196 pp. ; \$4.50). (British edition : Duckworth, London.)

Daniel Jenkins, *The Protestant Ministry* (194 pp. ; \$3.—). (British edition : Faber & Faber, London.)

Gibson Winter, *Love and Conflict*. New Patterns in Family Life (191 pp. ; \$3.50).

- THE ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE OF THE COMENIUS FACULTY OF PROTESTANT THEOLOGY, Prague :
The Struggle against Thermonuclear Weapons as a Task of the Church (52 pp.).
Kampf gegen thermonukleare Waffen als Aufgabe der Kirche (56 pp.).
- EDITIONS : ASSOCIATION DES DIACONESSES, Paris :
 G. Lagny, *Le Réveil de 1830 à Paris et les origines des diaconesses de Reuilly*. Préface du pasteur Marc Boegner (195 pp.).
- EDITIONS DE L'ÉGLISE NATIONALE VAUDOISE, Lausanne :
 Victor Baroni, *La Bible dans la vie catholique depuis la Réforme* (226 pp. ; Fr. 15.—).
- LES EDITIONS DU SEUIL, Paris :
 Henry van Etten, *George Fox et les Quakers*. "Maitres spirituels", No. 4 (192 pp.).
 Albert-Marie Schmidt, *Jean Calvin et la tradition calvinienne*. "Maitres spirituels", No. 12 (192 pp.).
- WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO., Grand Rapids :
 G. W. BROMILEY, *Sacramental Teaching and Practice in the Reformation Churches* (111 pp. ; \$1.50).
- EVANGELISCHER MISSIONSVERLAG, Stuttgart :
Liturgie für oekumenische Freizeiten, in deutscher, englischer und französischer Sprache. Edited by Johannes Stöckle (31 pp.).
- EVANGELISCHE VERLAGSANSTALT, Berlin :
Alte Briefe aus Indien. Unveröffentlichte Briefe von Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg, 1706-1719. Edited by Arno Lehmann (552 pp. ; DM 28.—).
- THE FAITH PRESS LTD., London :
Anglo-Russian Theological Conference Moscow, July 1956. A report of a Theological Conference held between members of a Delegation from the Russian Orthodox Church and a Delegation from the Church of England. With a preface by A. M. Ramsey. Edited by H. M. Waddams (120 pp. ; 15s.).
- THE FALCON'S WING PRESS, INDIAN HILLS, COL. :
Eleven Years of Bible Bibliography. The Book List of the Society for Old Testament Study, 1946-56. Edited by H. H. Rowley (804 pp. ; \$7.50).
- FISCHBACHER, Paris :
 Frédéric Hoffet, *L'Équivoque catholique*. Précédé d'une lettre ouverte à François Mauriac sur le Nouveau Cléricalisme (225 pp. ; Fr.fr. 750.—).
- FRIENDSHIP PRESS, New York :
Concerns of a Continent. Edited by James W. Hoffman, with contributions by the Editor and Leonard M. Perryman, A. C. Forrest, G. Baez Camargo (168 pp. ; \$2.95).
 R. Park Johnson, *Middle East Pilgrimage* (164 pp. ; \$1.50 and \$2.95).

HARPER AND BROTHERS, New York :

Donald K. Faris, *To Plow with Hope* (223 pp. ; \$3.75).

Harry Emerson Fosdick, *Riverside Sermons*. Introduction by Henry Pitney Van Dusen (362 pp. ; \$3.95).

Nels F. S. Ferré, *Christ and the Christian* (255 pp. ; \$3.75).

HERDER VERLAG, Freiburg im Breisgau :

Karl Färber, *Heilige sind anders*. Herder-Bücherei, 14 (187 pp. ; DM 1.90, Fr. 2.30).

J. P. Michael, *Christen suchen eine Kirche*. Die Ökumenische Bewegung und Rom. Mit Dokumenten und soziographischen Beilagen (188 pp. ; DM 1.90).

Boris Simon, *Abbé Pierre und die Lumpensammler von Emmaus*. Ein Aufstand der Nächstenliebe. Herder Bücherei (198 pp. ; DM 1.90, Fr. 2.30).

Die wichtigsten Glaubensentscheidungen und Glaubensbekenntnisse der katholischen Kirche. Edited by Rudolf Peil (85 pp. ; DM 3.80).

HERDER VERLAG, Wien :

Josef Andreas Jungmann, *Missarum Solemnia*. Eine genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe (2 vols. 4th ed. 633 & 659 pp. ; S. 280.—).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON, London :

T. F. Torrance, *When Christ Comes and Comes Again* (192 pp. ; 12s. 6d.).

UITG. HOLLAND, Amsterdam :

Dooptgezind gemeenteleven (84 pp. ; fl. 2.50).

J. N. Sevenster, *Rome en de vrije Bijbel* (231 pp.).

VAN GORCUM, Assen :

W. Goddijn, *Katholieke monderheid en protestantse dominant*. Met een woord vooraf van G.H.L. Zeegers (289 pp. ; fl. 15.50).

GREENWICH BOOK PUBLISHERS, New York :

Fred Z. Browne, *Visible Glory*. God's Promise for This Present Age... (133 pp. ; \$2.50).

Arthur D. Coleman, *Keeping Christmas Christian* (300 pp. ; \$3.50).

Harry Hutchison, *Why Baptize Infants*. The Ancient Christian Practice of Infant Baptism Explained for the Layman (85 pp. ; \$2.50).

Robert Matheson, *The Philosophy of all possible Revelation*. A Moral Essay and "Weltanschauung" by the Renowned Thinker of the Victorian Age (100 pp. ; \$2.50).

David B. Vanarsdall, *Heavenly Treasures*. A Study of what the Bible assures us about the Mansions that God hath prepared for them that love Him (23 pp. ; \$2.50).

CHR. KAISER VERLAG, München :

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ökumene*. Briefe — Aufsätze — Dokumente 1928 bis 1942. (Gesammelte Schriften Bd. 1, 550 pp. ; Sw. Fr. 24.50).

Gerhard von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Bd. 1. Die Theologie der geschichtlichen Überlieferungen Israels (472 pp. ; Sw. Fr. 27.35). (A

- translation is in preparation by Harper and Brothers, New York, and by Hodder and Stoughton, London.)
- Georg F. Vicedom, *Missio Dei*. Einführung in eine Theologie der Mission (104 pp. ; Fr. 8.10).
- Ernst Wolf, *Barmen*. Kirche zwischen Versuchung und Gnade. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, Bd. 27 (166 pp. ; Sw. Fr. 11.60).
- P. G. KELLER, Winterthur :
Emil Wasser, *Ökumenisches Christentum und Wirtschaft* (108 pp. ; Sw. Fr. 12.—).
- LITERATURE ON SOCIAL CONCERNS, Bangalore :
Human Person, Society and State. Edited by P.D. Devanandan and M. M. Thomas (140 pp. ; Rs. 3.—).
- LUTHER-AGRICOLA-GESELLSCHAFT, Turku, Finland :
Olavi Lähteenmäki, *Sexus und Ehe bei Luther* (195 pp. ; DM 11.80).
- LUTTERWORTH PRESS, London :
Oscar Cullmann and F. J. Leenhardt, *Essays on the Lord's Supper* (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, I) (87 pp. ; 7s. 6d.).
Essays in Christology for Karl Barth, edited by T. H. L. Parker (297 pp. ; 25s.).
T. S. Garrett, *Worship in the Church of South India* (Ecumenical Studies in Worship, II) (62 pp. ; 7s. 6d.).
- MARSHALL, MORGAN AND SCOTT, London :
Alan Walker, *The Whole Gospel for the Whole World*. Foreword by W. E. Sangster. Introduction by E. G. Homrighausen (128 pp. ; 8s. 6d.).
- J. M. MEULENHOF, Amsterdam :
B. van Gelder, *Spoor zoeken in de bonte wereld van geloven en denken* (229 pp. ; fl. 5.75).
- A. R. MOWBRAY & Co., London :
J. G. Davies, *Members One of Another*. Aspects of Koinonia (35 pp. ; 3s.).
- R. MÜLLER, Köln-Braunsfeld :
Hellmuth Heyden, *Kirchengeschichte Pommerns*. Bd. I & II (Osteuropa und der deutsche Osten, Reihe III, Buch 5) (243 & 288 pp.).
- OLIVER AND BOYD, Edinburgh :
Neill Q. Hamilton, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul*. Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, No. 6 (94 pp. ; 8s. 6d.).
- OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, London :
Documents on Christian Unity. Fourth series, 1948-57, edited by G. K. A. Bell (243 pp. ; 21s.).
George F. Kennan, *Russia, the Atom and the West*. The BBC Reith Lectures 1957 (120 pp. ; 10s. 6d.).
Guy Mayfield, *The Church of England ; its Members and its Business* (213 pp. ; 18s.).
Albert C. Outler, *The Christian Tradition and the Unity we Seek* (166 pp. ; 12s. 6d.).

- E. I. Watkin, *Roman Catholicism in England from the Reformation to 1950* (244 pp.; 7s. 6d.).
- D. A. PRAEGER, New York :
Milovan Djilas, *The New Class*. An analysis of the Communist System (214 pp.; \$3.95).
- THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED PUBLISHING COMPANY, Philadelphia, Pa. :
Gerrit C. Berkouwer, *The Conflict with Rome*. Translated under the supervision of David H. Freeman (319 pp.; \$5.95).
Loraine Boettner, *The Millennium* (380 pp.; \$4.50).
J. Marcellus Kik, *Ecumenism and the Evangelical*. (152 pp.; \$3.50).
Herman Ridderbos, *Paul and Jesus*. Origin and General Character of Paul's Preaching of Christ. Translated by David H. Freeman (155 pp.; \$3.50).
H. van Riessen, *The Society of the Future*. Translated and edited under the supervision of David Hugh Freeman (320 pp.; \$4.95).
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, Princeton :
Paul Elmer More, *The Sceptical Approach to Religion* (201 pp.; \$3.50).
- S.C.M. PRESS, London :
Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. The Franz Delitzsch Lectures for 1953 (84 pp.; 7s. 6d.). (U.S.A. edition : Alec R. Allenson Inc., Naperville, Ill.)
John Lawrence, *Hard Facts*. A Christian looks at the world (63 pp.; 3s. 6d.).
A. Allan McArthur, *The Christian Year and Lectionary Reform* (159 pp.; 25s.).
J. Davis McCaughey, *Christian Obedience in the University*. Studies in the Life of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland 1930-1950 (228 pp.; 25s.).
John T. Martin, *Christ Our Passover*. The Liturgical Observance of Holy Week (94 pp.; 8s.). (U.S.A. edition : Alec R. Allenson Inc., Naperville, Ill.)
E. H. Robertson, *Man's Estimate of Man* (125 pp.; 8s. 6d.). (U.S.A. edition : John Knox Press, Richmond, Virg.)
M. A. Thomas, *Meditations of an Indian Christian* (76 pp.; 5s.).
Carl-Friedrich von Weizsäcker, *Ethical and Political Problems of the Atomic Age* (22 pp.; 2s.).
Charles C. West, *Communism and the Theologians*. Study of an Encounter (399 pp.; 35s.). (U.S.A. edition : Westminster Press, Philadelphia.)
- C. SCRIBNER'S SONS, New York :
Sherman E. Johnson, *Jesus in His Homeland* (182 pp.; \$3.75).
Richard R. Niebuhr, *Resurrection and Historical Reason*. A Study of Theological Method (184 pp.; \$3.95).
Arnold Toynbee, *Christianity*. Among the Religions of the World (116 pp.; \$ 2.75).
- THE SEABURY PRESS, Greenwich, Conn. :
John Seville Higgins, *One Faith and Fellowship*. The Missionary Story of the Anglican Communion. Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury (226 p.; \$4.50).
Charles Duell Kean, *The Road to Reunion* (145 pp.; \$3.50).

SOCIÉTÉ CENTRALE D'ÉVANGÉLISATION, Paris :

Pierre Petit, *Lourdes, les protestants et la tradition chrétienne*. Collection "Les Bergers et les Mages" (134 pp. ; Fr. fr. 360.—).

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS, London :

Dewi Morgan, *The Restless Ones*. S.P.G. Review of the Year's Work, 1957-1958 (80 pp. ; 1s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K., London :

The Family in Contemporary Society. The report of a group convened at the behest of the Archbishop of Canterbury with appended reports from the U.S.A., Canada, and India (229 pp. ; 10s. 6d.).

J. C. Fenton, *Preaching the Cross*. The Passion and Resurrection according to St. Mark... (80 pp. ; 7s. 6d.).

Jakob Jocz, *A Theology of Election*. Israel and the Church. With a preface by F. D. Coggan (227 pp. ; 25s.).

Humphrey Whistler, *False Alternatives at the Reformation* (28 pp. ; 1s. 6d.).

J. STAUDA-VERLAG, Kassel :

Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie. 1. Jahrgang 1955. Edited by Konrad Ameln, Christhard Mahrenholz, Karl Ferdinand Müller (246 pp. ; Sw.Fr. 27.35).

Leiturgia. Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes, 22. Lieferung (p. 241-320 ; subsc. DM 3.80).

VERLAG UNSER WEG, Ulm-Donau :

Schuld und Verheissung deutsch-polnischer Nachbarschaft. Referate der Ostkirchentagung in Hameln 7.-9. Okt. 1957, edited by Ostkirchenausschuss (64 pp.).

VANDENHOECK UND RUPRECHT, Göttingen :

Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon. Kirchlich-theologisches Handwörterbuch. 28./29. Lieferung (255 pp. ; DM 9.60).

THE WESTMINSTER PRESS, Philadelphia :

Suzanne de Diétrich, *The Witnessing Community*. The Biblical Record of God's Purpose (180 pp. ; \$3.75).

George S. Hendry, *The Gospel of the Incarnation* (174 pp. ; \$3.75). (British edition : S.C.M. Press Ltd., London, 2s. 6d.)

Archibald M. Hunter, *Introducing New Testament Theology* (160 pp. ; \$2.50). (British edition : S.C.M. Press Ltd., London, 10s. 6d.)

Archibald M. Hunter, *Introducing the New Testament*. 2nd ed. (208 pp. ; \$3.00). (British edition : S.C.M. Press Ltd., London, 2s. 6d., paper 7s. 6d.)

Reinhold Niebuhr, *Love and Justice*. Selections from the Shorter Writings of R. N. Edited by D. B. Robertson (309 pp. ; \$ 6.—).

Erik Routley, *The Wisdom of the Fathers* (128 pp. ; \$2.25). (British edition : S.C.M. Press Ltd., London, 8s. 6d.)

Charles Francis Whitley, *The Exilic Age* (160 pp. \$3.50).

YMCA PUBLISHING HOUSE, Calcutta :

Eddy Asirvatham, *Christianity in the Indian Crucible*. 2nd and revised ed. (274 pp. ; Rs. 4.—).

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS AND ARTICLES

Frederik M. BARON VAN ASBECK is Professor of International Law at the University of Leiden and a member (formerly President) of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs.

R. Pierce BEAVER is Professor of Missions in the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago.

John W. HARMS is the Executive President of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

J. D. HUGHEY Jr. is Professor of Church History in the Baptist Theological Seminary in Rüschtikon, Zürich, Switzerland.

Edmund SCHLINK is Professor of Systematic Theology at Heidelberg University and Chairman of the German Ecumenical Study Committee.

The Editor's article on "The Super-Church and the Ecumenical Movement" is a somewhat revised edition of an address given to the Free Church National Congress at Folkestone in March 1958.

NOTES ON BOOK REVIEWERS

Ernst DAMMANN is Professor at the Institute for African Affairs, Humboldt University, Berlin.

Paul GÄBLER is a Lutheran pastor at Niedernjesa and Lecturer in Missions at Göttingen University, Germany.

Hans Heinrich HARMS is Associate Director of the Division of Studies, of the WCC, Geneva.

Vasil T. ISTAVRIDIS is Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the Theological School of Halki, Istanbul, Turkey.

Stephen C. NEILL is General Editor of World Christian Books.

Hildegard SCHAEFER is Secretary for Orthodox Questions in the Kirchliches Aussenamt, Frankfurt-on-Main, Germany.

Robbins STRONG is Extension Secretary of the World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations, Geneva.

Charles WEST is Resident Lecturer at the Ecumenical Institute, Bossey, near Geneva.

P. WIESER is Editor of the Schweizerischer Evangelischer Pressedienst, Zurich, Switzerland.

*New in the Library
of Christian Classics
Volume XXIII*

Calvin: Commentaries

Edited by JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN, in collaboration with LOUISE PETTIBONE SMITH. Here are approximately 400 pages of Calvin's commentaries on passages from the Old and New Testaments. Covered are such significant themes as Biblical unity, knowledge of God, the nature of Christ, Christian life, sovereignty of God, election and predestination, and the purpose of the church and its ministry. \$5.00

Westminster Books
living literature
of lasting significance

Introducing the New Testament

Revised and Enlarged

ARCHIBALD M. HUNTER's definitive survey of *all* of the writings of the New Testament in the light of modern scholarship. This new second edition has been revised and enlarged to make it the best popular introduction to Christian Scripture available today. \$3.00

The Meaning of Baptism

JOHN FREDERICK JANSEN presents an inspired series of meditations about baptism, suggesting new avenues of expression and practice so that baptism may be observed not as a social custom, but as a relevant symbol of living faith. \$2.50

The Gospel of the Incarnation

GEORGE S. HENDRY's important book presents the thesis that the Christian gospel concerns the total *fact* of Christ, and that He bore divine forgiveness to men not only in dying but also in living. \$3.75

Now at your bookstore
THE WESTMINSTER PRESS
Philadelphia 7

LAMBETH CONFERENCE 1958

THE FAMILY IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY

10s.6d.

**MISSIONARY COMMITMENTS
OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION**

3s.6d.

PRINCIPLES OF PRAYER BOOK REVISION

7s.6d.

**PRAYER BOOK REVISION
IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**

4s.6d.

**COMMEMORATION OF SAINTS AND HEROES
OF THE FAITH IN THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION**

6s.

**CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND THE METHODIST CHURCH**

3s.6d.

Published jointly with the Epworth Press

**THE OFFICIAL REPORT OF
THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE**

will be published

26 August

Paper, about 6s. Cloth about 10s.

by

S·P·C·K

Subscriptions

may be sent to any of the addresses given below:

SWITZERLAND WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, *The Ecumenical Review*

1 year Sw. Fr. 10.— 17 route de Malagnou, GENEVA.

3 years Sw. Fr. 27.— (Postal cheque Account I. 572)

ENGLAND and sterling area

1 year 14s

3 years £1.17.6

WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,

c/o 10 Eaton Gate, LONDON, S.W.1 (mention *The Ecumenical Review*). (Cheque or money order)

1 year 17s 6d (Austr.)

3 years A.£2.7.—

For **AUSTRALIA**, if preferred:

Australian Council for the World Council of Churches

472 Kent Street,

SYDNEY, N.S.W. (mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

1 year 14s

3 years £1.17.6

For **NEW ZEALAND**, if preferred:

New Zealand Student Christian Movement

P.O. Box 742,

WELLINGTON, C. 1 (mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

U.S.A., CANADA WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,

1 year \$3.—

3 years \$7.50

156 Fifth Avenue, NEW YORK 10, N.Y. (mention *The Ecumenical Review*). (Cheque or money order)

FRANCE and French Colonies

1 year Fr. frs. 750.—

3 years

Fr. frs. 2000.—

Comité d'Entr'aide des Eglises de la Fédération protestante de France,

47, rue de Clichy, PARIS IX^e (mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

(Postal cheque Account Paris 14 114 31)

HOLLAND

1 year Fl. 7.50

3 years Fl. 20.—

Persbureau der Nederlands Hervormde Kerk,

Javastraat 100, DEN HAAG (mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

(Postgiro 138211)

NORWAY

1 year N. Cr. 14.—

3 years N. Cr. 37.50

Pastor Henrik Hauge, Røshagan 25, RØA (mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

BELGIUM, DENMARK, SWEDEN and if possible other countries: payment

can be made by international postal order to Geneva to the equivalent amount of Sw. frs. 10.—. (Sw. frs. 27.—)

1 year Sw. Cr. 12.—

3 years Sw. Cr. 32.50

For **SWEDEN**, if preferred:

Nordiska Ekumeniska Institutet,

SIGTUNA (mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

(Postgirokonto 16 48 07)

1 year D. Cr. 14.—

3 years D. Cr. 37.50

For **DENMARK**, if preferred:

Det Økumeniske Fællesråd i Danmark

Vendersgade 28, COPENHAGEN K. (mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

(Postgiro 55710)

GERMANY

1 year DM. 10.—

3 years DM. 27.—

Frankfurter Bank, FRANKFURT/Main, Neue Mainzerstr.

(Postal cheque Account 154, for account of Ökumenischer Pressedienst No. 562 — mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

INDIA

1 year Rupees 10.—

3 years Rupees 27.—

National Christian Council Lodge, P.O. Bag 6 A,

NAGPUR 1, M.P. (Cheques should include a bank charge of

3 annas — mention *The Ecumenical Review*).

ITALY

1 year Lit. 1000.—

3 years Lit. 2700.—

Pastor Guido Comba, 107 Via IV Novembre, ROMA (mention

The Ecumenical Review).

(Postal cheque Account Roma 1/13986)

Advertisements may be sent to Geneva.

For the next issue, they should be in Geneva not later than August 20th, 1958.

Communism and the Theologians

Study of an Encounter

CHARLES WEST

35s net

Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism

edited by DAVID M. PATON — seventeen essays from Britain, India, Africa, Ceylon and China

25s net

Christian Obedience in the University

Studies in the life of the Student Christian Movement 1930-1950

J. DAVIS McCAUGHEY

25s net

The Kingdom of Christ

Volumes I and II

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, edited by Alec R. Vidler

August

15s net each

An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament

ALAN RICHARDSON

October

30s net

The Christian Message and Myth

The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann

L. MALEVEZ, S. J., translated by Olive Wyon (*The Library of Philosophy and Theology*)

October

25s net

The Growth of the Church in Buganda

An Attempt at Understanding

JOHN V. TAYLOR — the first of a new series of *Studies in the Life and Growth of the Younger Churches* undertaken by the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches.

Illustrated

November

25s net

SCM PRESS LTD

56 Bloomsbury Street London WC1